School of Theology at Claremont
10011459159

BAPTISMAL REMISSION.

REV. G. W. HUGHEY, A. M., D. D.

BV
811.7
H8



Methodist
Historical Society

Southern California-Arizona
Conference



Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California



G. W. Hughes

BV
811-7
H8

BAPTISMAL REMISSION;

OR,

THE DESIGN OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

BY

REV. G. W. HUGHEY, A. M., D. D.,

OF THE

ST. LOUIS CONFERENCE, METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

George Washington
1832-

"For what is the use of that baptism which cleanses the flesh and body alone? Baptize the soul from wrath and from covetousness, from envy and from hatred; and lo! the body is pure."—JUSTIN MARTYR.

CINCINNATI: CRANSTON & STOWE.
NEW YORK: HUNT & EATON.
1891.

Copyright
By CRANSTON & STOWE,
1891.

PROPERTY OF
HISTORICAL LIBRARY

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

THE CHRISTIAN RULE OF FAITH.

POLITICAL ROMANISM.

INGERSOLL AND INGERSOLLISM.

THE LIQUOR-TRAFFIC.

CATECHISM ON BEER.

WOMEN IN THE GENERAL CONFERENCE.

PREFACE.

FIVE years ago last November, at the request of Rev. T. J. Wheat, then presiding elder of Hannibal District, Missouri Conference, I preached a sermon before the District Conference of that district, on the "Design of Christian Baptism." Bishop Ninde was present, and heard the sermon, and expressed himself afterward in the following manner concerning it:

"TOPEKA, KAN., January 16, 1886.

"I listened with great interest to a discourse by Rev. G. W. Hughey, D. D., on the "Nature and Design of Water Baptism," which was delivered at Centralia, Missouri, in November last. The sermon was very lengthy, occupying an hour and three quarters, and yet the attention of the large and intelligent audience was unabated to the close. I have never heard a controverted theme discussed with greater clearness and force, or in better spirit. The subject was handled with great compass of thought and keen analytical power, while the Scripture citations, in their lucid exposition and apt application, were striking and convincing. The author would render a great service to our Churches in many parts of the country if he would put his discourse in pamphlet form, and give it a wide circulation. The unscripturalness and absurdity of baptismal regeneration, by whomsoever held, are made manifest to the dullest apprehension in this admirable sermon. W. X. NINDE."

I accordingly prepared and published a book of one hundred and forty-nine pages, covering the

ground occupied by the sermon, enlarged so as to cover the whole question of baptismal remission. Through a misunderstanding, the publisher melted the plates, and after the first edition was exhausted, and many calls were made for the book, which could not be supplied, I determined to revise and rewrite the book, and again give it to the public. Nothing essential to the argument has been left out, while much has been condensed, and some new matter has been added.

The questions discussed in this little volume are not questions of "modes and forms," but they enter into the very essence and life of Christianity. No more important question can be propounded to the human mind than the question: "How can the sinner obtain remission of sins?" Eternal life or eternal death hinges upon the answer to this important question. The whole history of the human race shows us how prone the human heart is to substitute the outward forms for the inward, spiritual life of religion; and that just in proportion to the decrease or loss of spiritual life in the individual or the Church, there is the tendency to exalt the outward forms, and lay stress upon the sacraments of the Church. The most wide-spread and dangerous heresy that afflicts Christendom to-day is the doctrine of baptismal remission and sacramental salvation. The Church of Rome, the Greek Church, the High Church party in the Protestant State Churches of Europe, and

their representatives in this country, the Church of the Latter-day Saints, or Mormons, and the so-called Christian or Campbellite Church, all hold and teach the doctrine of baptismal remission. Opposed to these stand the evangelical portion of the State Churches of Europe and their representatives in America, the Presbyterians, Baptists, Congregationalists, and Methodists, who deny the doctrine of baptismal remission, and hold that baptism is the outward sign of an inward, spiritual grace.

The question between the advocates and opponents of the doctrine of baptismal remission is really this: "Is the religion of the Lord Jesus an inward spiritual life, or is it an outward form of sacramental and ritualistic observances?" This doctrine is essentially "*another gospel*" at war with every principle of the gospel of Christ. This we have fully shown in this little book, which we send forth again in the name of the Master, praying that it may be made a blessing to thousands in leading them into a clear knowledge of the Scriptural method of remission of sins.

G. W. HUGHEY.

SPRINGFIELD, Mo., June, 1891.

Methodist Historical Society Southern California - Arizona Conference

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

The Question Stated—Baptism Instituted, . . . Pages 7–10

CHAPTER II.

The Doctrine of the Church of Rome, ... Pages 11–14

CHAPTER III.

The Doctrine of Alexander Campbell, and the So-called Christian or Campbellite Church, ... Pages 15–25

CHAPTER IV.

Some Objections to the Foregoing System of Sacramental Salvation, ... Pages 26–31

CHAPTER V.

Water the Standing Symbol of the Holy Spirit in Both the Old and New Testaments, and the Application of Water to the Body, as a Religious Ordinance, the Standing Symbol of Spiritual Cleansing, . Pages 32–47

CHAPTER VI.

Statement of Proposition—Two Baptisms—One Real, the other Symbolical—One the Soul with the Holy Ghost, the other the Body with Water—One Performed by Man, the other by God, ... Pages 48–66

CHAPTER VII.

Born of Water, and the Washing of Regeneration, Pages 67–75

CHAPTER VIII.

JEWS NEVER TAUGHT BAPTISM FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS, NOR COMMANDED ANY ONE TO BE BAPTIZED FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS DURING THE ENTIRE PERIOD OF HIS PERSONAL MINISTRY ON EARTH, ... Pages 76–82

CHAPTER IX.

BAPTISM FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS—EXAMINATION OF PROOF TEXTS—JOHN'S BAPTISM, ... Pages 83–97

CHAPTER X.

BAPTISM FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS (Acts ii, 38)—CONVERSION OF CORNELIUS AND HIS HOUSEHOLD—REMISSION OF SINS THROUGH FAITH IN HIS NAME—THEIR HEARTS PURIFIED BY FAITH, ... Pages 98–110

CHAPTER XI.

THE APOSTLES EVERYWHERE TEACH THAT IT IS THROUGH FAITH, AND NOT AN ACT OF FAITH, THAT PARDON OR REMISSION OF SINS IS OBTAINED—THEY AFFIRM AN IMMEDIATE CONNECTION BETWEEN FAITH AND THE PARDON OF SINS, Pages 111–118

CHAPTER XII.

PAUL'S GREAT ARGUMENT ON JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH WITHOUT WORKS (Romans iv)—ABRAHAM'S JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH—FAITH IMPUTED FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS—ABRAHAM'S JUSTIFICATION BY WORKS (James ii, 21–24), . . Pages 119–133

BAPTISMAL REMISSION.

CHAPTER I.

THE QUESTION STATED—BAPTISM INSTITUTED.

WHAT is the design or intent of Christian baptism? For what specific end was it instituted? Was it ordained by our Lord to be the laver of regeneration, in which both original sin and actual transgressions are washed away, and by which the soul is regenerated and put in possession of divine life? Or was it ordained as the last in a series of conditions upon which the penitent believer can alone obtain remission of sins? Or was it ordained as an outward sign of the purification of the soul from the moral pollution of sin by the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit? These are the questions we propose to discuss in the following pages, and ascertain, if we can, from the oracles of God, for what intent our Lord ordained this sacrament in his Church.

Many persons suppose that baptism, as a religious ordinance, was instituted by John the Baptist. This is a grievous mistake. Baptism, as a religious ordinance, existed among the Jews from the days of

Moses. All the religious purifications by water enjoined by the law Paul calls baptisms. (Heb. x, 10.) The term baptism was applied to them when the Greek language first came into use among the Jews after the conquest of Alexander, some three hundred years before Christ. This is evident from the fact that in the Wisdom of Sirach, chapter xxxiv, 36, the purification from a dead body is called "a baptism from a dead body;" and in Judith, chapter xii, 7, where she purified herself before prayer, it is said "she baptized herself." So, also, the purifications of the Jews before eating, and after being at the markets, were called baptisms; as were also the purifications of "cups, pots, brazen vessels, and couches." (Matt. vii, 4; Mark Luke xi, 38.)

These facts make it clear that baptism was not a new institution among the Jews, instituted by John the Baptist; but that it had existed among them from the beginning of their history as a nation, and that its import, intent, and design was well understood by them. This fact will aid us very materially in ascertaining the intent or design of baptism as a Christian ordinance, and as practiced by John the Baptist.

No one will contend for a moment that baptism under the law of Moses was designed to wash away sin, either original or actual; or that it was enjoined as the last in a series of conditions of the remission of sins. Yet it was divinely instituted, and had a specific

intent or design; and that specific intent or design was that of an emblem of spiritual purification. The facts here stated, I presume, will not be called in question by any one, whatever his views may be in regard to the intent of Christian baptism. It is hardly to be presumed that John the Baptist and our Lord would take an old ordinance, which had been in use for fifteen hundred years among the Jews, and invest it with a totally different signification from that which it had possessed throughout the whole period of Jewish history, and enjoin it with this new signification as the most essential act of obedience in the gospel. Much less is it a supposable case that he would take that which had been but the *emblem* of spiritual cleansing under the dispensation of "the letter," and make it the *real* spiritual cleansing, or the final condition of remission of sins under the dispensation of "the Spirit." Yet this is precisely what he did, if baptism is the laver of regeneration, or the condition of the remission of sins. It is certainly in the highest sense probable, that if our Lord took an ordinance of the law, the import of which was well understood, and transferred it over into the gospel, he would do it because it was understood, and because he could thereby teach an important lesson of the gospel by means of the symbolism of the law. It is, therefore, the highest presumption that he invested baptism, which he took from the law, with the same intent or import it had under the law, and that he

intended it to be the outward sign or emblem of the purification of the soul from the defilement of sin. We shall see, as we proceed with the argument, that this was the intent with which he invested the Christian ordinance.

CHAPTER II.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

THE Church of Rome holds and teaches that grace is received only through the sacraments, and that baptism is the sacrament of salvation, consequently it is absolutely necessary to be baptized in order to be saved, and that no one, either adult or infant, can obtain either remission of actual transgressions or purification from original sin without baptism.

In the seventh session of the Council of Trent, the following, among other canons "on the sacraments in general," were enacted:

"CANON IV. If any one saith that the sacraments of the New Law are not *necessary unto salvation*, but superfluous; and that *without them*, or without a desire thereof, men obtain of God, *through faith alone, the grace of justification*, though all (the sacraments) are not indeed necessary for every individual, let him be anathema.

"CANON VI. If any one saith that the sacraments of the New Law *do not contain the grace which they signify; or that they do not confer that grace* on those who do not place an obstacle thereunto, *as*

though they were merely outward signs of grace or justice received through faith, and certain marks of the Christian profession, whereby believers are distinguished amongst men from unbelievers, let him be anathema.

"CANON VII. If any one saith that grace, as far as God's part is concerned, *is not given through the said sacraments, always, and to all men,* even though they receive them rightly, but (only) sometimes, and to some persons, let him be anathema.

"CANON VIII. If any one saith that by the said sacraments of the New Law grace is not conferred through the *act performed* (*ex opere operato*), but that faith alone in the divine promises suffices for the obtaining of grace, let him be anathema."

In the Canons on Baptism, passed by the same session, we have the following:

"CANON V. If any one saith that Baptism is free—that is, *not necessary unto salvation*—let him be anathema."

In the Catechism of the Council of Trent, on page 127, the "first effect" of baptism is declared to be "to remit original sin and actual guilt, however enormous."

Again, on page 128, we read: "*The remission of all sin, original and actual,* is therefore the *peculiar effect of baptism.* That this was the object of its institution by our Lord and Savior, is a truth clearly deduced from the testimony of Saint Peter, to say nothing of the array of evidence that might be ad-

duced from other sources: 'Do penance,' says he, 'and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins.'"

The second effect of baptism is set forth on the same page, thus: "But in baptism not only is sin forgiven, but with it all the punishment due to sin is remitted by a merciful God." On page 128, we read: "*Baptism remits all the punishment due to original sin in the next life.*"

On page 131, the sixth effect of baptism is declared to be: "By baptism, moreover, we are sealed with a character that can never be effaced from the soul."

On page 132 we are told as the seventh effect of baptism: "Besides the many other advantages which accrue to us from baptism, we may look upon it as the last to which all the rest seem to be referred, *that it opens to us the portals of heaven,* which sin had closed against our admission."

On page 123 we read: "If, then, through the transgression of Adam children inherit the stains of primeval guilt, is there not stronger reason to conclude that the efficacious merits of Christ the Lord must impart to them that justice and those graces which will give them a title to reign in eternal life? *This happy consummation* BAPTISM ALONE *can accomplish.* The pastor, therefore, will inculcate the *absolute necessity* of administering baptism to infants."

It will be seen from the above declarations of the

Canons of the Council of Trent, and of the Catechism drawn up in conformity thereto, that the Church of Rome holds and teaches:

1. That all grace is received through the sacraments of the Church, and without the sacraments no grace can be received by us.

2. That the sacraments *contain* the grace which they signify.

3. That on God's part grace is given *always*, and to *all men*, through the sacraments.

4. That in the sacraments grace is given by "*the act performed.*"

5. That the sacrament of baptism is necessary unto salvation.

6. That by baptism the guilt of both original sin and actual transgression is remitted; that by it the punishmeut due to sin, both original and actual, both in this life and the next, is remitted; that the depravity and corruption of the nature is washed away ALONE in baptism, and the baptized are sealed with a new character that can never be effaced, and by it the portals of heaven are opened to them. All these wonderful effects the Church of Rome ascribes to baptism, and hence she teaches that without this sacrament no soul of man, infant or adult, can ever enter the kingdom of God.

CHAPTER III.

THE DOCTRINE OF ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, AND THE SO-CALLED CHRISTIAN OR CAMPBELLITE CHURCH.

MR. ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, who may be styled in no invidious sense the father and founder of the so-called Christian or Campbellite Church, in his work on baptism, which may be regarded as his maturest thoughts on that question, when treating on the "Design of Baptism," says:

"Nor is it only casually intimated that New Testament baptism was ordained for this purpose (the remission of sins). It is *the only purpose* for which it was ordained, whether in the hands of John or of the twelve apostles. What could be more plain or intelligible than such forms of expression as the following: 'John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach *the baptism* of repentance for the remission of sins.' (Mark i, 4.) It was not *a* baptism, but *the* baptism of repentance. It was not for remission of sins, but for *the* remission of sins. The fixtures of language could not more safely secure the intention of an institution. It was not *because* your sins *have been remitted*, but it *is for* or *in order to* the remission of sins." (Pp. 249, 250.)

Again he says:

"In the first place, then, no one is commanded to be baptized *for anything else*, and no one is ever said to be baptized *for anything else*, than for the remission of sins." (P. 252.)

Again:

"Evident, then, it is, that there is no *specific design* on account of which any one can constitutionally be baptized, except it be for the remission of sins previously committed. We are not commanded to be baptized for faith, for repentance, for justification, for regeneration, for sanctification, for adoption, for the Holy Spirit, for eternal life. We are commanded to be baptized '*for the remission of sins*'—not for the remission of *original* sin, not for the remission of sins yet to be committed or in advance; but for the remission of sins that are past, that have been committed, 'through the forbearance of God.'" (P. 253.)

Again:

"While, then, baptism is ordained for remission of sins, and for no other specific purpose, it is not as a procuring cause, as a meritorious or efficient cause, but as an instrumental cause, in which faith and repentance are developed and made fruitful and effectual in the changing of our state and spiritual relations to the Divine Persons whose names are put upon us in the very act." (P. 256.)

In speaking of the "Consequents of Baptism," Mr. Campbell says:

"But we do not separate these, in nature nor in operation, from one another; no more can we separate faith, repentance, and baptism, in regeneration or conversion, according to the spiritual agencies concurrent in forming a new man out of an old man. We are, indeed, enlightened, converted; or, rather, we are enlightened, quickened, regenerated, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved by the truth believed and obeyed. Faith and obedience are in embryo twin sisters in the heart of a convert; and are developed, manifested, and perfected by the overt acts of confession and profession, or by faith and baptism." (P. 275.)

Again:

"In our baptism, we are born into the divine family, enrolled in heaven. We receive justification or pardon, we are separated or sanctified to God, and glorified by the inspiration of his own Spirit." (P. 276.)

In his "Christianity Restored," page 198, in speaking on remission of sins, he says:

"PROP. IX. *That it is not faith, but an act resulting from faith, which changes our state, we shall now attempt to prove.*"

Again he says on the following page:

"The apostle Peter, when first publishing the gospel to the Jews, taught them that they were not forgiven their sins by faith; but by an act of faith, by a believing immersion into the Lord Jesus."

On page 203, he says:

"PROP. X. *I now proceed to show that immersion and washing of regeneration are two Bible names for the same act, contemplated in two different points of view.*"

On page 205, he says:

"As regeneration is taught to be equivalent to '*being born again,*' and understood to be of the same import with a new birth, we shall examine it under this metaphor. For if immersion be equivalent to regeneration, and regeneration be of the same import with being born again, then being born again and being immersed are the same thing; for this plain reason, that things which are equal to the same thing, are equal to one another. *All must admit that no person can be born again of that which he receives.* For as no person is born naturally, so no person can be born again, or born metaphorically, of that which he receives."

Again:

"In being born naturally, there is the begetter and that which is begotten. These are not the same. The act of being born is different from that which is born. Now the Scriptures carry this figure through every prominent point of coincidence. There is the begetter. 'Of his will he has begotten,' or impregnated us, says James the apostle. '*By the word of truth,*' as the incorruptible seed; or as Peter says, 'We are born again, not from corruptible, but from incorruptible seed, the Word of God which endureth

forever.' But when the act of being born is spoken of, then the water is introduced. Hence, before we come into the kingdom, we are born of water. . . . Persons are begotten by the Spirit of God, impregnated by the word, and born of water."

"In one sense a person is born of his father; but not until he is first born of his mother. So in every place where water and the Spirit, or water and the Word, are spoken of, *the water stands first.* Every child is born of its father when it is born of its mother. Hence the Savior put the mother first, and the apostles follow him. No other reason can be assigned for placing the water first. . . . *Now, as soon as,* AND NOT BEFORE, a disciple, who has been begotten of God, is born of water he is born of God, or of the Spirit. *Regeneration is, therefore, the act of being born.* . . . To call the receiving of any spirit, or any influence or energy, or any operation upon the heart of man, regeneration, is an abuse of all speech, as well as a departure from the diction of the Holy Spirit, WHO CALLS NOTHING PERSONAL REGENERATION EXCEPT THE ACT OF IMMERSION. . . . He who can not see the propriety of calling immersion a being born again, can see no propriety in any metaphor in common use. A resurrection is a new birth. Jesus is said to be the first *born* from the dead, because the first who rose from the dead to die no more. And, surely, there is no abuse in speech, but the greatest propriety, in saying that he who has

died to sin, and been buried in water, when raised up again out of that element is born again, or regenerated. If Jesus was born again when he came out of a sepulcher, surely he is born again who is raised up out of a grave of waters.

"Those who are thus begotten and born of God are children of God. It would be a monstrous supposition that such persons are not freed from their sins. To be born of God and born in sin is inconceivable. Remission of sins is as certainly granted to 'THE BORN OF GOD' as life eternal, and deliverance from corruption will be granted to the children of the resurrection when born from the grave." (Pp. 205–208.)

Again:

Sixth. "And the great argument pertinent to our object, in this long examination of conversion and regeneration, is that which we conceive to be most apparent of all other conclusions, viz.: that remission of sins, or coming into a state of acceptance, being one of the present immunities of the kingdom of heaven, can not be enjoyed by any person before immersion. As soon can a person be a citizen before he is born, or have the immunities of an American citizen while an alien, as one can enjoy the privileges of a son of God before he is born again. For Jesus expressly declares that he has not given the privilege of sons to any but to those born of God. If, then, the present forgiveness of sins be a privilege, and a right of those

under the new constitution, in the kingdom of Jesus; and if being born again, or born of *water* and of the Spirit, is necessary to admission, and if being born of *water* means *immersion,* as clearly proved by all witnesses, then remission of sins can not in this life be received and enjoyed previous to immersion. If there be any proposition, regarding any item of the Christian institution, which admits of clearer proof or fuller illustration than this one, I have yet to learn where it may be found." (P. 213.)

On page 214 he says:

"Immersion ALONE was that act of turning to God. . . . And from the day of Pentecost to the final AMEN in the revelation of Jesus Christ, no person was said to be converted, or turned to God, until he was buried in and raised up out of the water."

Mr. Campbell teaches that there is efficacy in water to wash away sin. On pages 220 and 221, of "Christianity Restored," he says: "Here are two things equally incomprehensible—to wash garments WHITE in blood, and to wash away sins in water! An efficacy is ascribed to water which it does not possess, and, as certainly, an efficacy ascribed to blood which it does not possess. If blood can whiten or cleanse garments, certainly water can wash away sins. There is, then, a transferring of the efficacy of blood to water, and a transferring of the efficacy of water to blood. This is a plain solution of the whole mat-

ter. God has transferred, in some way, the whitening efficacy, or cleansing power, of water to blood, and the absolving or pardoning power of blood to water. This is done upon the same principle as that of accounting faith for righteousness. What a gracious institution! God has opened a fountain for sin, for moral pollution. He has given it an extension far and wide as sin has spread—far and wide as water flows. *Wherever* WATER, *faith, and the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are, there will be found the efficacy of the blood of Jesus.* Yes, as God first gave the efficacy of water to blood, he has now given the efficacy of blood to water. This, as was said, is figurative; but it is not a figure which misleads, for the meaning is given without a figure, viz.: immersion for the remission of sins. And to him that made the washing of clay from the eyes the washing away of blindness, it is competent to make the immersion of the body in water efficacious to the washing away of sin from the conscience."

I have quoted thus at length from Mr. Campbell, that the reader may fully understand his teaching from his own language, and that there might be no possible grounds to charge me with misrepresentation. From the foregoing it is clear that Mr. Campbell holds and teaches:

1. The design of baptism is for the remission of sins; that it was instituted, commanded, and practiced for this SPECIFIC DESIGN, and for NO OTHER; and that

there is no other object or design for which it can be constitutionally administered to any one.

2. That baptism is a condition precedent to the remission of sins, so important and so essential that "remission of sins can not, in this life, be received or enjoyed previous to immersion."

3. That baptism and conversion are the same, and that baptism is the converting act.

4. That baptism is regeneration or the new birth, and that no person ever was or ever can be born of God except by "being buried in and raised up again out of the water."

5. As consequents of baptism, a man is justified, adopted, sanctified, enlightened, saved, "enrolled in heaven, and glorified by the inspiration of the Spirit," and filled with all the fruits of grace.

6. By carefully examining the teaching of the Church of Rome and that of Mr. Campbell in regard to the design and effects, or consequents, of baptism, we find an exact agreement in every point so far, except in the matter of the remission of, or purification from, original sin. With Mr. Campbell there is no original sin to be forgiven, or cleansed from, and hence he rejects that part of the teaching of Rome on the design and efficacy of baptism; but he accepts the whole doctrine of Rome in regard to the pardoning and regenerating efficacy of baptism, with all her teaching as to its effects or consequents.

7. But Mr. Campbell goes beyond Rome when he

makes water our mother! God's Word nowhere speaks of a mother as necessary to the new birth, but always speaks of it as a birth from God. But Mr. Campbell can not see how there can be a birth without a mother, and hence he provides one in the water!

8. Mr. Campbell here makes a distinction between being "begotten of God" and "born of God." Mark this.

9. He ascribes a cleansing and saving efficacy to water.

10. He makes the "fountain of cleansing" for sin a fountain of water.

11. He limits or circumscribes the possibility of salvation or cleansing from sin by the extent of water.

Mr. Braden, in his debate with me, said:

"Having thus prepared the way for our investigations, we now take up the law of pardon, and inquire if baptism is one of the conditions of the remission of sins. Let me here say that the conversion of the sinner is a progressive work. It is not accomplished by any one single act, but by a succession of acts, in their proper order, and each having its proper position and design. Each is necessary, and without it all subsequent acts would never be performed. These steps or acts are:

"1. Hearing the gospel.

"2. Believing the gospel, or faith.

"3. Repentance.

"4. Confession of Christ.

"5. Obedience or baptism.

"6. Pardon or remission.

"We do not contend for any one of these alone, but for all; for the law of God demands all. We do not pronounce one more important than the rest, for all are necessary to pardon. We do not attempt to tear them asunder, and place pardon where God has not placed it; for we have no power to do so. We place baptism last, not because we regard it as the most important, but because God's law places it there. We regard it as the last condition, the crowning act of man's restoration to God's favor, which he performs himself." (Debate, pp. 187, 188.)

Mr. Braden here states the doctrine of his Church fully and concisely. There is no dissent among them from this presentation of their doctrine.

CHAPTER IV.

SOME OBJECTIONS TO THE FOREGOING SYSTEM OF SACRAMENTAL SALVATION.

THERE seem, to my mind, many insuperable objections to this system of baptismal remission and sacramental salvation. Among the many, I present a few.

OBJECTION 1. No intelligent man can believe it. Even its strongest advocates do not believe it. Every one of them will repudiate it when pressed with the consequences which logically and necessarily follow from it, and declare that there are multitudes of persons to whom the gospel is preached who have received remission of sins, enjoy the favor of God, and will be saved, who have never been baptized. But their admission of this fact, which they can not avoid, proves that the whole system is false, and rests upon a perversion of the Word of God.

According to this doctrine of baptismal remission, as taught by Mr. Campbell, Mr. Braden, and the Church which they represent, Luther, Wesley, Whitefield, Edwards, Payson, Fletcher, and all the holy men and women who have blessed the world with their consecrated lives, and died with the shout of triumph on their lips, who had not been immersed (for noth-

ing is baptism with them but immersion) were aliens from God, unregenerated—unpardoned rebels against the Divine Government—died unforgiven, and were eternally lost! But they do not believe this—no man in his senses can believe it. Yet, if these holy men of God were saved, the whole doctrine of baptismal remission is false and unscriptural; for, according to this system, they were never baptized.

OBJECTION 2. This system of baptismal remission and sacramental salvation takes the salvation of the penitent believer out of the hands of Christ, the "one mediator between God and man," and puts it into the hands of a second mediator—a mediator between Christ the Savior and the penitent believer—an administrator of baptism! This accords exactly with the doctrine of Rome; for with her the priest stands in the place of Christ, and the penitent sinner can reach Christ only through the priest. But it is utterly abhorrent to evangelical Protestant teaching and to the Holy Scriptures. When the broken-hearted penitent sinner is ready to receive Christ by faith, there is no power in earth or hell that can prevent his forgiveness and salvation a single moment. But this doctrine of baptismal remission teaches that the penitent sinner may be ready to receive Christ, and the all-loving heart of Christ may be reaching out in intense longings to save him; but a sinful man, a priest or an administrator of baptism, may step in between Christ and the believing penitent, and call a halt in the work

of salvation, and thwart the love of Christ and make void the faith of the penitent by refusing to administer the sacrament of baptism, through which alone remission of sins can be obtained. A doctrine that involves such consequences is at war with the teachings of the Holy Scriptures and repugnant to the common sense of mankind.

OBJECTION 3. It limits the efficacy of the blood of Christ to the physical element of water. Mr. Campbell says: "What a gracious institution! God has opened a fountain for sin, for moral pollution. He has given it an extension far and wide as sin has spread—far and wide as WATER FLOWS. Wherever faith, WATER, and the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are, there will be found the efficacy of the blood of Jesus!" According to this, where WATER is not found, there "the efficacy of the blood of Jesus" can not be found. But this is not all. Water must be found in sufficient quantity for immersion, or the blood of Jesus can have no efficacy. According to this teaching, there are vast portions of our planet where the efficacy of the blood of Jesus can not be found. Can any man in his senses accept such a monstrosity as the gospel of the Son of God?

OBJECTION 4. This doctrine of baptismal remission makes the salvation of multitudes impossible. There are multitudes of cases where the immersion of the penitent believer is impossible. Such cases are constantly occurring. We could give many ex-

amples which have occurred. Is it possible that the all-wise God, in providing a method of salvation for sinners, would make such a blunder as to devise a method that would make the salvation of multitudes impossible?

OBJECTION 5. It completely reverses the gospel order of repentance and faith. In this system faith *always precedes repentance.* In the New Testament repentance *always precedes faith.* There is not a single exception to this rule.

In Mark i, 14, 15, we read: "Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God; and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye, and believe the gospel."

Jesus always put repentance before faith, and taught that repentance was a condition of the proper exercise of faith.

In Matthew xxi, 32, we read: "For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not; but the publicans and harlots believed him; and ye, when ye had seen it, repented not afterward, that ye might believe him."

In Acts xx, 21, Paul says: "Testifying, both to Jews and also Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ."

This is the order of repentance and faith everywhere in the New Testament. There is not an example where faith precedes repentance; but always

repentance first, and then faith. Here we have a perfect contrast between this system of baptismal remission and the New Testament.

OBJECTION 6. This doctrine of baptismal remission flatly contradicts the Word of God, which teaches that the penitent believer is "justified *by faith,*" while it affirms that we are not justified *by faith,* but by "*an act of faith.*" Jesus says (John iii, 18): "He that believeth on him is not condemned." But this system says this is not true, and Jesus was mistaken; for a man may believe in Christ, and still be under condemnation, until, by an *act of faith*—that is by baptism—he crosses the line into the justified state. John the Baptist said: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." (John iii, 36). But this system says this is not true, for a man can not have eternal life until he receives it by an *act of faith.* Paul says: "Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God." (Romans v, 1.) But this system says Paul was mistaken, for a man is not justified by faith at all, but by *an act of faith.* Jesus said to the weeping penitent: "Thy faith hath saved thee." (Luke vii, 50.) But this system says Jesus was mistaken, for it is not faith that saves, but *an act of faith.* Peter said of Cornelius and his household: "And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as *he did* unto us, and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith." (Acts

xv, 8, 9.) But this system declares that Peter was mistaken, that God did not purify their hearts by faith, but by *an act of faith;* that is, by baptism.

Which are we going to believe—Jesus, John the Baptist, Peter, Paul, and John, or this system of baptismal remission? We can not believe both, for there is a flat contradiction in their teachings. Throughout the whole Bible, pardon or remission of sins is never said to be received by or through *an act of faith;* but always and everywhere pardon, justification, purification, and salvation from sin are declared to be received *by faith.*

CHAPTER V.

WATER THE STANDING SYMBOL OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN BOTH THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS; AND THE APPLICATION OF WATER TO THE BODY AS A RELIGIOUS ORDINANCE, THE STANDING SYMBOL OF SPIRITUAL CLEANSING.

WATER is the standing symbol of the Holy Spirit throughout both the Old and New Testaments, and the application of water to the body as a religious ordinance is the standing symbol of spiritual cleansing. This fact of itself ought to settle the controversy as to the intent or design of baptism in every thoughtful mind.

In Isaiah xxxv, 6, 7, we read: "Then shall the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing; for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert. And the parched ground shall become a pool, and the thirsty land springs of water."

In Isaiah xliv, 3, we read: "For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground."

That there might be no doubt left on the mind as to the meaning of the figure here employed, the prophet immediately adds in explanation: "I will

pour my Spirit upon thy seed and my blessing upon thine offspring."

In Isaiah lv, 1, we read: "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters."

In Jeremiah ii, 13, we read: "For my people have committed two evils: they have forsaken me the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water."

In Jeremiah xvii, 13, we read: "O LORD, the hope of Israel, all that forsake thee shall be ashamed, and they that depart from me shall be written in the earth, because they have forsaken the LORD, the fountain of living waters."

In Zechariah xiv, 8, we read: "And it shall be in that day that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; half of them toward the former sea, and half of them toward the hinder sea; in summer and in winter shall it be."

Such passages might be multiplied indefinitely, but these are sufficient to prove conclusively that throughout the Old Testament, water was used as the standing symbol of the Holy Spirit; that God, who is the fountain of all spiritual blessings, is called "the fountain of living waters."

The New Testament is equally explicit. In the conversation of Jesus with the woman of Samaria this fact is brought out fully. "Then saith the woman of Samaria unto him, How is it that thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me, which am a woman of

Samaria? . . . Jesus answered and said unto her, If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith unto thee, Give me to drink, thou wouldest have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water. The woman saith unto him, Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep; from whence then hast thou that living water? Art thou greater than our father Jacob, which gave us the well, and drank thereof himself, and his children, and his cattle? Jesus answered and said unto her, Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again; but whosoever drinketh of water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." (John iv, 9–14.)

In John vii, 37–39, we read: "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. (But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified.")

Surely these explicit statements of the Son of God himself are sufficient to prove that in the New Testament, as well as in the Old, water is the standing symbol of the Holy Spirit. They prove, too, that wherever Jesus uses the term "water" in a re-

ligious sense, *he means the Holy Spirit.* Hence, when he says, "Except a man be born of water," he does not mean physical water, but he means the Holy Spirit just as certainly as he does in John vii, 38, where there can be no question whatever about the meaning of the word water; for John expressly affirms that by water in that passage he does mean the Holy Ghost. Jesus's use of the word water in these passages throws a flood of light on John iii, 5, and removes all the difficulty in the way of getting a right understanding of the expression "born of water."

Having thus established the fact, beyond the possibility of controversy or cavil, that water throughout both Testaments is the standing symbol of the Holy Spirit, I now proceed to prove that cleansing by water, or the application of water to the body as a religious rite or ordinance, is throughout both Testaments the symbol of spiritual cleansing, and not that cleansing itself, any more than water is the Holy Spirit.

The whole Jewish ritual was a system of types or symbols, divided into two grand divisions—bloody sacrifices and watery ablutions—which could neither purge away sin nor purify the soul. The one pointed to the great atoning sacrifice of "the Lamb of God," which can alone expiate sin; the other, to the cleansing power of the Holy Spirit, which can alone purify the heart. This great truth is brought out fully in Hebrews ix, 8–14.

In Psalm li, 7, David says: "Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." Surely he did not believe that the foul stains of adultery and murder, that were cleaving to his guilty soul, could be washed out by sprinkling the water of purification upon his body with a bunch of hyssop! What does he mean, then, when he uses this language in his penitent plea for pardon? He himself explains what he means in verse ten, where he says: "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me." In his prayer for pardon and purity, he first asks for these blessings under the symbol through which they were shadowed forth; and then dropping the symbol, he asks for the "clean heart" and "renewed spirit," without a figure. There is no possible chance of misunderstanding the psalmist here; all are agreed that sprinkling with hyssop could not make David morally clean, and that under this figure he asked for the spiritual cleansing it symbolized.

In Ezekiel, xxxvi, 25–27, we read: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do *them*."

Will the advocates of baptismal remission and purification contend that the house of Israel in Ezekiel's time, or in the time to which this prophecy refers, were really cleansed from all their idolatries and moral uncleanness by having clean water sprinkled upon them? Not for a moment will they contend for any such thing. If *immersion* had been the mode of purification, they might have contended that it really washed away the sins and spiritual pollutions of the house of Israel; but *sprinkling* is the mode, and it will not do for them to contend that it could wash away sin! In this passage the application of water to the body by sprinkling is simply emblematic of the cleansing of the soul. There can not be found a passage in the New Testament in which purification by water, or remission of sins by baptism, is as explicitly taught as it is here declared that David and the house of Israel were made morally clean by *sprinkling* water upon them. If these passages do not teach spiritual purification by water, no passages in the Bible can, for language could not more explicitly declare a thing than it is here declared that David and the house of Israel should be made clean by "SPRINKLING."

Yet no one mistakes the import of these passages, so as to confound the real cleansing of David and the house of Israel with the symbol of it. How is it, then, that the advocates of baptismal remission can not understand the relation existing between the real

cleansing from sin under the gospel, and its emblem, baptism? I could affirm with greater plausibility that sprinkling with water under the law of Moses washed away sin, and prove it by a stronger array of Scripture passages, than the advocates of baptismal remission can that baptism under the gospel is for the remission of sins.

When we come to the New Testament, we find that the same relation exists between the application of water to the body in baptism to spiritual purification, that existed under the law between the religious washings of the Jews and spiritual cleansing; that it does not cleanse from sin, that it does not remit sin, but it is the emblem of spiritual purification. This is proved:

First. By the fact, which we shall establish in the next chapter, that there are two baptisms among "the principles of the doctrine of Christ"—one of water, the other of the Holy Ghost; one the baptism of the soul by Christ, the other the baptism of the body by a human administrator; the one purifying the soul and putting us into Christ, the other the emblem of it.

Second. By the language of John the Baptist, Jesus, and Peter. John said: "I indeed baptize you with water; He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." Jesus said: "For John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Peter said, when he saw the household of Cornelius baptized with the Holy Ghost:

"Then remembered I the Word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." These passages all show plainly the relation of these two baptisms to each other to be that of the *real* and *symbolical;* the one conferring spiritual purity, the other emblematic of it.

Third. Paul expressly declares that this is the relation between baptism and spiritual cleansing in Hebrews x, 22: "Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from our evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." This passage, when properly understood, settles the whole controversy.

Here are two things done—one on *the "heart,"* the other on *the "body."* The heart is "sprinkled," the body is "*washed.*" It will not be contended by the advocates of baptismal remission that the "sprinkling" and "washing" are one and the same thing, for *obvious reasons.* The results accomplished are as distinct as the processes described. The result accomplished by the "sprinkling of the heart" is totally different from that accomplished by the "washing of the body." The washing of the body unquestionably means baptism, for the New Testament knows no other application of water to the body as a religious rite. We are now prepared to note:

1. Paul here affirms that the "heart" is purified "from an evil conscience" by "SPRINKLING."

2. This "*sprinkling,*" which purifies the heart "from an evil conscience," is not a sprinkling of *the body,* but of THE HEART.

3. The "heart" being purified "from an evil conscience" *by* "*sprinkling,*" it could not be purified by "washing the body with pure water," or by baptism.

Mr. Campbell, as we have seen, makes baptism wash away "sin from the conscience." He says: "And to him that made the washing of clay from the eyes the washing away of blindness, it is competent to make the immersion of the body in water efficacious to the washing away of sin *from the conscience.*" (Christianity Restored, pp. 220, 221.)

In commenting on 1st Peter iii, 21, he says: "Thus immersion," says Peter, "saves us, not by cleansing the body from its filth, but the conscience from its guilt." (Christian System, p. 215.) Here Mr. Campbell flatly contradicts the apostle Paul, who affirms that the conscience is cleansed from its guilt, neither by immersion nor washing of the body; but by the "*sprinkling of the heart!*" No contradiction could be more complete than the contradiction here between Paul and Mr. Campbell, as to how the conscience is cleansed from guilt. One affirms that it is done by "*sprinkling the heart,*" the other that it is done by "*the immersion of the body!*"

In the baptism of the Holy Ghost, the Holy Spirit applies the merit of Christ's death to the soul, by which sin is pardoned and the sense of guilt

removed from the conscience, and this is called "sprinkling the blood of Jesus Christ," by Peter (1 Peter i, 2), and by Paul in this place, "having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience." Having the heart purified by "sprinkling," the body is then washed in token of this inward purification; thus baptism sustains unquestionably in this passage the relation to purification from sin, of an outward emblem of this inward spiritual cleansing. This fixes the relation of baptism to remission of sins and spiritual cleansing throughout the whole New Testament; for here it is positively affirmed that the conscience is purified from guilt by "sprinkling the heart," and not by "washing the body," or by baptism.

There is here unquestionably reference to the law of purgation from guilt, and the ceremonial cleansing which followed, as there is throughout this epistle to the services under the law of Moses. The priest sprinkled the blood of atonement to remove guilt, and then washed in token of the purification received through the blood of sprinkling; so Jesus Christ, our Great High Priest, by the Holy Spirit, sprinkles our hearts with his own blood, purging away our guilt, and then we receive baptism in token of this inward purification.

The very same relation between the purification of the conscience and baptism is maintained by Peter (1 Peter iii, 21): "The like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the

filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Now let us note here:

1. Peter affirms that baptism does in some sense save us, "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

2. In the parenthetical reading he tells us (1) how it does *not* save us; and (2) how it does save us. It does *not* save us by "putting away the filth of the flesh." Now we ask: "What does Peter mean by 'the filth of the flesh?'" He can mean but one of two things. He must mean either (1) literal dirt on the body, or (2) moral pollution on the soul. He can mean nothing else. Now, which does he mean? Mr. Campbell, as we have seen, says he means *literal dirt on the body.* But can we believe that the washing of "the body from its filth," or dirt, could be styled by Peter salvation, or a saving of us? Yet he is here talking of salvation by baptism, not washing dirt from the body by baptism. (3) Were the persons to whom Peter addressed this epistle in danger of misunderstanding the nature of salvation to such an extent that he had to explain to them, by a parenthetical reading, that salvation did not mean the washing of the dirt from their bodies? Yet, this interpretation necessarily involves the idea that the inspired apostle feared that these Christians to whom he wrote, and who had themselves received the personal knowledge of salvation, through the remission of sins and the regeneration of their hearts, might

come to the conclusion that all there was in their salvation was the washing of a little dirt from their bodies, and he must explain to them that this was not what he meant by salvation. (4) But baptism, however performed, whether by sprinkling, pouring, or immersion, does not wash the literal dirt from the body, and no one could for a moment suppose that it was designed for any such purpose, or could save in any such sense; and for the inspired apostle to assure the Christians to whom he wrote in the most solemn manner that baptism did not save them by doing what every one knew it did not and could not do, would have been the veriest trifling. (5) The word used by Peter (*apothesis*), here translated "putting away," does not mean "to wash" or "to wash away." The idea of wash is not in the word, nor is it in the passage. It is the same word which is used by Peter (2 Peter i, 14), when he says:

"Knowing that shortly I must PUT OFF THIS my tabernacle." Here it means to "put off" or lay aside the body, and in 1 Peter iii, 21, it means the same thing; that is, to "put off" or "lay aside," not "the filth of the flesh." Both times it is used by the same writer, and in the same sense.

Greenfield defines it: "A putting off, or away, laying aside."

Parkhurst defines it: "A putting away or off."

Liddell and Scott define it: "A laying away or by, laying up in store."

Not one of them gives the meaning of wash or washing away. This idea is not in the definitions of the word given by the lexicons, and is not in its use in the New Testament or elswhere. Had "washing away" been the thought in the mind of the apostle, "*apolusis*," from "*apolouo*," would have been used, which is defined by Liddell and Scott, "*A washing off, ablution.*"

This is the word used by Ananias to Paul (Acts xxii, 16): "And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and *wash away* thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." And in 1 Cor. vi, 11: "And such were some of you; *but ye are washed.*" Had Peter been speaking of *washing away* either *dirt* or *sin*, he would have used this word, which is the one always used to express this idea, and not *apothesis*, which has not the idea of wash in it, and which is never used to express the idea of washing. These facts prove conclusively that Peter is not here speaking of washing dirt from the body.

3. He does mean by the expression, "the filth of the flesh," moral pollution, or sin. (1) The terms "*sarx*," or "*sarkos*," we know, is often used in the New Testament to mean the carnal or unregenerate mind; and "the filth of the flesh" in this sense can only mean sin, or moral pollution, proceeding from the unregenerate heart. As examples of the use of the term *sarx* (*flesh*), where it has this meaning: Rom. viii, 1–4, 6–9; Col. ii, 11; 1 Peter iv, 2; 2 Peter x, 18; 2 Peter ii,

10–18. (2) The word *rupos*, here translated *filth*, occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, but in classic usage it means both literal filth and moral pollution, and is so defined by Liddell and Scott, Parkhurst, and Greenfield. In this passage it unquestionably means moral pollution; for men are saved, not by removing dirt from the body, but sin from the soul. (3) Its derivative, *rupoo*, is used twice in the New Testament in the same verse Rev. xxii, 11, "and he which is FILTHY, let him be FILTHY still;" and it unquestionably means moral pollution or filth.

4. Its kindred *ruparia*, is used but once (James i, 21): "Wherefore, lay apart all FILTHINESS and superfluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls." There can be no controversy here as to the meaning of this word; all admit it means moral *filth* or pollution.

The conclusion is irresistible, that "the filth of the flesh" in this passage means moral pollution, and not literal dirt. Having established this fact, this passage is a direct and positive affirmation that baptism *does not put away sin.* Language could not be more explicit than the language here used. With this interpretation of the passage, the reason for inserting the parenthetical reading is apparent. No one was ever liable to believe that baptism "saves us" by washing the literal dirt from our bodies; but the whole history of the Church proves that men are constantly liable

to suppose that baptism "saves us" by "washing away" sin from the soul; hence Peter put in this parenthetical reading to guard against this error by positively affirming that it does not "save us" by "*putting away sin.*"

5. But if there is any doubt still lingering in the mind as to the meaning of this passage, the latter clause of the parenthetical reading will settle it: "But the answer of a good conscience." Here note that baptism does not make the conscience good—*does not give* or *secure a good conscience;* but it is "*the answer of a good conscience.*" If it is, as Peter affirms, "*the answer of a good conscience,*" then it does not make the conscience good "by cleansing it from its guilt," as Mr. Campbell affirms it does. The word *eperotema,* here translated *answer,* occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, but *eperotao* occurs fifty-eight times, and is used always in the sense of asking a question. Liddell and Scott define *eperotema* "a question."

Greenfield defines it: "An *interrogation, question;* in New Testament, answer, promise, engagement, profession (1 Peter iii, 21)."

Parkhurst defines it: "*An asking;* or rather, *an answer* or *promise in consequence of beiny asked.*"

Now, in whatever sense we understand the apostle to use this word, the result is the same. If we understand it in the sense of "*to ask,*" then baptism does not give the good conscience; that is, it does not

purge the conscience from its guilt; but as the symbol of this inward purification, it asks for that which it can not confer. Baptism can not *confer* a good conscience and *ask* for it at the same time. If baptism is "the *asking for* a good conscience," then it is as plain as the noonday's sun that it can not *confer* a good conscience. A man asks for that which he does not possess, and therefore can not give; and if baptism is "the asking" for a good conscience, then it does not and can not make the conscience good. If we understand it in the sense of an "answer," as our translators have rendered it, the result is the same; for baptism can not be "the *answer* of a good conscience," and at the same time give or secure a "good conscience." The "good conscience"—that is, remission of sins and the purification of the heart—is obtained somehow through the resurrection of Christ, "who was delivered for our offenses, and raised again for our justification;" and baptism, as the divinely appointed symbol of this inward purification, is "the answer of this good conscience."

Here, then, Peter affirms that "baptism doth now save us, NOT BY PUTTING AWAY SINS," but by "answering" to that inward spiritual cleansing, which is accomplished in us by the Holy Spirit applying the blood of Christ, by which alone the conscience can be purged from its guilt.

Methodist
Historical Society
Southern California - Arizona
Conference

CHAPTER VI.

STATEMENT OF PROPOSITION: TWO BAPTISMS—ONE REAL, THE OTHER SYMBOLICAL—ONE THE SOUL WITH THE HOLY GHOST, THE OTHER THE BODY WITH WATER—ONE PERFORMED BY MAN, THE OTHER BY GOD.

THE PROPOSITION which I affirm, and which I shall endeavor to prove in the following pages, is, that water baptism is neither the new birth, nor the condition of the remission of sins; but that faith in Jesus Christ is the one and sole condition of the justification of the penitent sinner.

There are *two* baptisms among the principles of the doctrine of Christ.

In Hebrews vi, 1, 2, Paul says: "Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, of the doctrine of BAPTISMS, and laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment." Here we have enumerated among the principles of the doctrine of Christ, "the doctrine of *baptisms*," consequently, there must be more than *one baptism* among "the principles of the doctrine of

Christ;" principles which, like "repentance, faith, the resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment," are permanent and abiding doctrines or principles of the gospel. The plural, "*baptisms*," makes it certain that there are two baptisms among the doctrines or principles of the gospel, which are permanent in the Church, and which shall never cease while the Church remains on earth. Now, if we can find out what these two baptisms are, the place they each occupy in the system of gospel doctrine, and the relations they sustain to each other, there will be no difficulty in ascertaining the design of water baptism.

John the Baptist said: "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but there cometh one after me who is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and fire." (Matt. iii, 11.)

Jesus said: "For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence."

Here we have the *two* baptisms, which are permanently incorporated among the principles of the doctrine of Christ,—one of *water*, the other of the *Holy Ghost;* one administered by man on the body, the other administered by the Lord Jesus on the soul. These two baptisms, of course, can not be administered for the same purpose—they must be administered for different ends. We know that the advocates of baptismal remission deny that the baptism of the

Holy Ghost is permanent in the Church, and claim that it pertained only to the apostolic age, and that it was always accompanied by the gift of tongues; in short, that it was one of the miraculous gifts that pertained to the apostles, and that passed away with them. But this plea is unsupported by the Word of God. There is not a hint in the words of John the Baptist, Christ, or the apostles, that the baptism of the Holy Ghost, promised the multitudes by John, and promised by Christ to his disciples, and received by them for the first time in its fullness on the day of Pentecost, should be confined to the apostles or the apostolic age. On the contrary, the language used naturally implies the permanence of this baptism in the Church of Christ.

John said: "I indeed baptize you with water. . . . He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." Here it is plain that John promised the baptism of the Holy Ghost to the *same persons* he baptized with water,—it is not a promise of a *special blessing* to a *special class* of believers, but to the whole multitude who should receive Christ. More than this, it implies that while John's mission was only to baptize *with water*, the mission of Christ should be especially to baptize with the *Holy Ghost;* that while John baptized his disciples with water only, Christ should baptize his disciples with the Holy Ghost. This fact is made prominent by John in his addresses to the multitudes who flocked to his baptism. In Mark i, 8,

he says: "I indeed have baptized you with water: but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." In Luke iii, 16, we read: "John answered, saying unto *them* all, I indeed baptize you with water; but one mightier than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." In John i, 38, he says: "And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost."

1. In all these passages John represents the special work of Christ to be that of baptizing with the Holy Ghost. He draws the contrast between his baptism of water and Christ's baptism of the Holy Ghost. As he came specifically to baptize with water, so Christ came specifically to baptize with the Holy Ghost.

2. The promise of Jesus to his disciples contains no such limitation, while his general teaching in regard to the gift of the Holy Ghost to his disciples, throughout the whole gospel, is that it should be the common heritage of all believers.

3. In the fulfillment of the Master's promise, "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence," on the day of Pentecost, the whole body of believers present, amounting to one hundred and twenty, received this baptism—apostles, laymen, and women alike received it.

4. Peter affirmed that this fulfillment of our Lord's promise of the baptism of the Holy Ghost was also the fulfillment of Joel's prophecy: "But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel, And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions and your old men shall dream dreams: and on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy."

Now, it is as clear as language can make it, that the baptism of the Holy Ghost, which the Church of Christ received on that day, and which was the fulfillment alike of the promise of Jesus and the prophecy of Joel, is permanently to abide in the Church, and to be the common heritage of all who believe in Jesus. No other meaning can be given to this passage, without doing the greatest violence to the language used. The prophecy which began to be fulfilled on that day, is still being fulfilled, and will be to the latest generation of the saved; and the baptism of the Holy Ghost received by the disciples in "the upper room" on the day of Pentecost is still being received by believers, and will be as long as men receive Jesus Christ by faith.

5. Having established the fact that there are *two* baptisms permanently abiding in the Church, among "the principles of the doctrine of Christ," the one

the baptism of the soul by the Holy Ghost, administered by Christ, purifying the heart, and cleansing the soul from sin, and the other by water, administered by a human administrator upon the body, it follows, with all the force of demonstration, that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is the *real* baptism, while that of water is but the *symbolical;* the real baptism cleanses and purifies the soul, while the symbolical—that of water applied to the body—takes its place in the economy of the gospel, only as an outward sign of this inward spiritual cleansing, received by the baptism of the Holy Ghost.

6. Having established the proper Scriptural relation between these two baptisms, which hold their places permanently among "the principles of the doctrine of Christ," it follows inevitably also, that wherever a saving efficacy is ascribed to baptism in the New Testament, it *must* apply to the baptism of the Holy Ghost, which alone has saving efficacy, and not to water baptism, which only symbolizes the saving efficacy of the baptism of the Holy Ghost.

7. Paul expressly declares that it is by the baptism of the Holy Ghost that we are put into Christ: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether *we be* Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." (1 Cor. xii, 13.)

Paul is here speaking of the one body of Christ which is made up of all true believers, who are

brought into, or made members of, that one body by the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Now let us note:

First. In this passage it is affirmed that we are *all* made members of the one body of Christ by being baptized into it, by the *one Spirit;* consequently this baptism of the Spirit is performed upon *every* member of the body of Christ, and none enter that body "whether Jew or Gentile, bond or free, male or female," *except by this baptism of the Holy Spirit.* This settles at once and forever the question as to whether the baptism of the Holy Ghost was the privilege of the few, and only for the purpose of conferring miraculous gifts, by proving that it is the privilege of all believers, and that it is performed upon all believers to constitute them members of Christ's body.

Second. Paul does not say, "For by one WATER we are all baptized into one body;" but he says, "by one SPIRIT." It is not the baptism of *water* he is talking about, but the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

Third. He affirms that we are all made to drink into the one Spirit, by which we are baptized into the one body.

Fourth. Having proved that Paul affirms that we are made members of the one body of Christ by the baptism of the Holy Spirit, it follows necessarily that whenever he speaks of being "put into" Christ, "buried with him," or "in him, by, in, or through baptism," that he must be speaking of the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

The advocates of baptismal remission claim that when Paul says, "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body," he does not mean what he says; but he means that it is "*by the direction of one Spirit* that we are all baptized into one body!" But this attempt is utterly futile, for it is not by the direction of "the one Spirit" that we are baptized with water, but by the express command of the Lord Jesus. Jesus and the Holy Spirit are not one and the same person in the Godhead, and the specific acts and commands of the one are never ascribed to the other. Our Lord, in his own proper person, instituted and commanded the baptism of water, and it is by his express command or direction that we are baptized with water, and not by the "*direction*" of the Holy Spirit inspiring either prophet or apostle.

2. But if it is by the "*direction* of one Spirit that we are all baptized," then it is by "the direction of one Spirit that we are all made to drink!" But what are we made to drink in or of by the direction of "the one Spirit?" This shows the absolute absurdity of this interpretation of this passage. No, Paul is not here talking about being baptized by the direction of "one Spirit," or being "made to drink by the '*direction*' of one Spirit;" but he is talking of being baptized by the Holy Spirit, and of drinking into the same Holy Spirit by which the soul is baptized into the body of Christ. No art, no sophistry, can evade the force of this passage, and,

while it stands in the Word of God, it stands as an eternal refutation of the doctrine that the penitent believer is made a member of Christ's body or put into Christ by water baptism. It also establishes the fact, beyond controversy, that all believers in all ages receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and by it are made members of the one body of Christ.

There are three other passages in Paul's writings where he ascribes the same results to baptism that he does in this, in all of which we are compelled to understand him to be speaking of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, or make him flatly contradict himself by affirming in one place that we are put into Christ by the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and in another that we are put into him by the baptism of water. Paul is not guilty of such self-contradictions, and hence, in all of these passages, he must necessarily be speaking of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, which he here affirms puts us into the one body of Christ. It is a noteworthy fact that in none of these passages does he speak of *water* in connection with baptism, but in them all he ascribes to the baptism of which he is speaking the same effects or results he ascribes to the baptism of the Holy Spirit in this passage.

In Galatians iii, 26–29, he says: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male

nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

Now, note that he here affirms:

1. That these Galatians had "been baptized into Christ."

2. That they had "put on Christ" by being "baptized into" him.

Now, we ask by what baptism does Paul say we are "baptized into Christ?" He gives the answer himself: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." It is the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Hence in this passage he is and must be speaking of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and not the baptism of water.

In Romans vi, 1–6, he says: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also *in the likeness* of *his* resurrection: knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him; that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin."

1. Paul here affirms that the Roman Christians were "baptized into Jesus Christ."

2. That being thus "baptized into Jesus Christ," they were "baptized into his death."

3. That they "were buried with him by baptism into death;" that is, into the benefits of his death.

4. That being raised up out of the death of sin by this baptism they "should walk in newness of life."

5. That having been "planted together in the likeness of his death" by this baptism, they should also "be in the likeness of his resurrection."

6. That they were "crucified with him" by this baptism, "that the body of sin might be destroyed."

Now, we inquire, what baptism is it which Paul affirms puts us into Christ, and confers upon us all the benefits of his death? Is it the baptism of *water*, or the baptism of the *Holy Ghost?* Again the answer comes: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, and have all been made to drink into one Spirit." It is the baptism of the Holy Spirit which puts us into Christ, and confers upon us all these spiritual benefits; hence it must be this baptism of the Holy Spirit of which he is speaking. There is no mention of *water* in the passage, and no hint that he is speaking of water baptism; but, on the other hand, the effects ascribed to this baptism are those which he affirms elsewhere pertain only to the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

This proves conclusively that in this passage he is

speaking exclusively of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, by which we are put into Christ and made members of his body, and not of the baptism of water, by which this great spiritual change is only symbolized.

In Colossians ii, 10–12, we read: "And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power; in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sin of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with *him* through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead."

In addition to the fact, which runs through all these passages, that Paul here ascribes to the baptism of which he speaks effects which, he declares in 1 Corinthians xii, 13, result alone from the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and which of itself is sufficient to prove conclusively that he is here speaking of that baptism, and not the baptism of water, we note the following facts stated by him in this passage:

1. He affirms that the Christians at Colosse were "circumcised with the circumcision made without hands," which is "the circumcision of Christ."

2. He affirms that it was by this "circumcision" that they had put "off the body of the sins of the flesh."

3. It is evident from the language used that the "circumcision" by which the "body of the sins of

the flesh" was put off, and the "baptism" in which the Christians were "buried with him," are one and the same thing; for "the body of the sins of the flesh" could not first be "put off" by the "circumcision *made without hands*," and then be remitted by a baptism performed *with hands*. If, then, "the circumcision of Christ," by which "the body of the sins of the flesh" was "put off," was "made without hands"—that is, was spiritual and not physical—then the baptism, which is most certainly the same thing, was performed "without hands;" that is, was spiritual, and not physical.

4. In Romans ii, 28, 29, Paul affirms that the real circumcision "is of the heart, in spirit." "For he is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh. But he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision *is that of* the heart, in the spirit *and* not in the letter, whose praise *is* not of men, but of God."

Now, if the circumcision of the Jew was "that of the heart, in the spirit," certainly the circumcision of Christ can not be that of "the letter, in the flesh;" but must be "of the heart, in the spirit" also.

Now, whether the advocates of baptismal remission will admit that the "circumcision" of verse 11 and the baptism of verse 12 are one and the same or not, this passage effectually refutes their doctrine that sins are remitted or washed away in baptism; for Paul here expressly affirms that "the body of the

sins of the flesh" is "put off," remitted, or washed away by an inward spiritual process, which he calls "the circumcision made without hands"—"the circumcision of Christ." If sins are remitted, *put off*, or washed away by an inward spiritual process, performed "*without hands*," then it is manifest to all men that they can not be remitted, *put off*, or washed away by an outward physical process, performed *with hands*. Whatever view may be taken of the relation the circumcision of verse 11 has to the baptism of verse 12, this passage forever settles the fact that sins are not remitted, *put off*, or washed away in or by water baptism; but by the inward cleansing power of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, here called the *circumcision of Christ*, and which is declared to be made "*without hands*;" that is, not physical.

5. The character of the resurrection here fixes the character of the burial effected by the baptism, and to which it stands in antithesis. "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with *him* THROUGH THE FAITH OF THE OPERATION OF GOD." The resurrection here is unquestionably *spiritual*, and accomplished by FAITH. But the resurrection in water baptism, performed by immersion, is *physical*, and accomplished by the *physical power of the administrator*. The resurrection being spiritual, the burial to which it stands in antithesis must be spiritual, and so must the baptism also be spiritual, by which the burial and resurrection are accomplished. It is evident, then,

that the baptism in this passage is the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and not the baptism of water.

The great difficulty in the way of the advocates of baptismal remission, in properly understanding all these passages of the Holy Scriptures, arises from their denial of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Having repudiated Paul's statement that there are BAPTISMS among the *principles* of the *doctrine* of Christ, and holding that there is but one baptism, that of water, they must, of course, interpret every passage in the writings of the apostles which speak of baptism as referring to water baptism. The moment that we accept the doctrine of John the Baptist, Jesus, Peter, and Paul that there are two baptisms—one of water, the other of the Holy Spirit, the one purifying the soul from sin, the other the application of water to the body in token of that inward spiritual purification—the difficulties all vanish, and the Word of God becomes harmonious and consistent with itself. But the moment we reject this plain and unmistakable doctrine of the Word of God, we make the teaching of Christ and the apostles, in regard to remission of sins and spiritual cleansing, a bundle of contradictions—destroy the spirituality of the gospel, give it a materialistic basis, and constitute the sacraments the only channel through which grace and forgiveness of sins can reach us.

I know that the interpretation here given to Romans vi, 1, 6, and Colossians ii, 11, 12, is not the one

commonly given by commentators, which is that in these passages there is an allusion to the ancient manner of baptism by immersion. But after a most patient and careful examination of the subject, I was compelled, years ago, to abandon the commonly received interpretation of these passages, and adopt the one I have given in the preceding pages. Ancient as the practice of baptizing by immersion may have been, after a most thorough investigation of the subject during the past thirty-eight years, I have found no evidence that it was so ancient as the days of the apostles.

But whatever may have been the mode of baptism practiced in the days of Paul, these passages furnish conclusive internal evidence that they do not refer to water baptism at all, and the trouble with Biblical expositors on this point has been, they have not given the baptism of the Holy Ghost its proper place in the economy of the gospel. As we have already shown, when once it is proved that in the New Testament we have *two* baptisms—one of water and the other of the Holy Ghost, the one cleansing the soul from sin, and baptizing us into the body of Christ, the other only symbolizing that spiritual cleansing—it follows irresistibly that whenever we have a baptism spoken of that cleanses the soul, *puts us into Christ*, buries us in or with him, it is, and must be, the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and not the baptism of water. It seems to me the dullest intellect can

not help seeing that this is the case. But while the interpretation which I have given these passages is not the one usually given them, I do not stand alone by any means. Prof. Moses Stuart, one of the most thoroughly learned Biblical scholars this country has ever produced, takes the same view I do of these passages. In his commentary on Romans vi, 1, 6, he says:

"Most commentators have maintained that *sunetaphemen* has here a necessary reference to the mode of literal baptism, which they say was by *immersion;* and this, they think, affords grounds for the employment of the image used by the apostle, because *immersion* (under water) may be compared to a *burial* (under the earth).

"It is difficult, perhaps, to procure a patient rehearing for this subject, so long regarded as being out of fair dispute. Nevertheless, as my own conviction is not, *after protracted and repeated examinations,* accordant here with that of commentators in general, I feel constrained briefly to state my reasons.

"The first is, that in the verse before us there is a plain *antithesis;* one so plain that it is impossible to overlook it. If now *sunetaphemen* [we are buried] is to be interpreted in a *physical* way, *i. e.* as meaning baptism in a physical sense, where is the corresponding *physical* idea in the opposite part of the antithesis or comparison? Plainly there is no such *physical* idea or reference in the other part of the antithesis. The

resurrection there spoken of is entirely a *moral, spiritual one;* for it is one which Christians have already experienced, during the present life; by comparing verses 5, 11, below. . . .

"If we turn to the passage in Colossians ii, 12 (which is altogether parallel with the verse under examination, and has very often been quoted by polemic writers on the subject of baptism), we shall there find more conclusive reason still, to argue as above, respecting the nature of the *antithesis* presented. We have been buried with him (Christ) by baptism. What now is the 'opposite' of this? What is the kind of *resurrection* from this grave in which Christians have been buried? The apostle tells us: 'We have risen with him [Christ], by faith wrought by the power of God, who raised him [Christ] from the dead.' Here there is a *resurrection by faith; i. e.,* a *spiritual moral* one. Why, then, should we look for a physical meaning in the antithesis? If one part of the antithesis is to be construed in a manner entirely *moral* or spiritual, why should we not construe the other in like manner? To understand *sunetaphemen,* then, of a *literal* burial *under water* is to understand it in a manner which the laws of interpretation appear to forbid." (Com. on Rom., pp. 252, 253.)

Again he says: "*The being baptized into* his death is, therefore, AN INTERNAL, MORAL, SPIRITUAL THING, of which the external rite of baptism is only a symbol; for the relation symbolized by baptism is, in its own

nature, spiritual and *moral.* The PARTICIPATION IN THE DEATH OF CHRIST, of which Paul here speaks, is surely something more than what is external; it is of a MORAL or SPIRITUAL nature, of which the external rite is merely a symbol." (Ibid., p. 252.)

CHAPTER VII.

BORN OF WATER, AND THE WASHING OF REGENERATION.

HAVING established incontrovertibly in the preceding chapters the fact that water is the standing symbol of the Holy Spirit, throughout the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and that the purification of the body by water is the standing symbol of spiritual cleansing—that the baptism of water is but the symbol of the baptism of the Holy Spirit—I might rest the argument here. But the advocates of baptismal remission need "line upon line, and precept upon precept," to make them understand the spiritual nature of the religion of the Lord Jesus, and the relation the outward forms of Christianity sustain to its inward spiritual life. Hence we must follow them step by step, and rescue the Scriptures, passage by passage, from the perversions of their materialistic interpretations.

We have already seen, in Chapter III, that Mr. Campbell teaches that *immersion* is regeneration, or the new birth; that "*immersion* is the act of *being born*;" that no man can be "born of that which he receives;" consequently, in his system there is no

birth of the Spirit at all. He says: "A man can not be born of that which he receives." The Holy Spirit is received, therefore no man ever was or ever can be born of the Holy Spirit. All that Jesus means by being "born again," "born of the Spirit," etc., is *immersion*, and nothing else. In the light of these statements, let us examine the expression "born of water and of the Spirit."

It is a remarkable fact that, while a spiritual birth is spoken of throughout the New Testament under different forms of expression, "born of God," "born of the Spirit," "born from above," "born again," etc., "born of water" occurs but once in the whole gospel record—John iii, 5. A ruler of the Jews had come to Jesus to inquire concerning his doctrine, and Jesus had announced to him the great truth: "Except a man be born again he can not see the kingdom of God." Nicodemus could not understand what Jesus meant by being born again, and in astonishment he asks: "How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born?" Jesus then explains to him that he is not talking about a *physical*, but a *spiritual* birth, and illustrates his meaning by a figure with which the mind of every Jew was familiar, and says: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." Dropping the figure or illustration, Jesus proceeds: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the

Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." Nicodemus still could not understand what Jesus meant by being born of the Spirit, and he asked again in astonishment: "How can these things be?" Can it be possible that our adorable Lord could have spoken of so simple a thing as being immersed under a figure so difficult to understand on the part of his auditor? When, according to Mr. Campbell, he dropped the figure and spoke plainly of *immersion* as a "birth of water," Nicodemus still could not understand it. Surely, there is no such mystery about *immersion* that a learned "master in Israel" could not understand how a man could be *immersed!* We marvel the more at the ignorance of Nicodemus, when we remember that, according to Mr. Campbell, "John, *the immerser*," had been showing to all the "masters in Israel" how easy and simple a thing it was to be "born of water"—that is, to be *immersed*—for at least ten or twelve months before this conversation took place! With these facts before him, can any man be so lost to common sense as to believe that by "born again," "born of water and of the Spirit," and "born of the Spirit," in this passage, Jesus meant only being immersed?

It is evident, then, that Jesus did not mean baptism when he spoke of being "born again," "or born

of the Spirit." This being the case, if "born of water" means baptism, then baptism and regeneration, or the new birth, are not one and the same thing. Demonstration itself could not be clearer than this. If "born of water" means baptism, then "born of water" and "born of the Spirit" are two distinct births, and a man "must be born again" TWICE, or he can not enter into the kingdom of God.

The new birth is a *spiritual* transformation, and not a *physical* action. It is the regeneration of the heart, and not the washing of the body; and, because of its spiritual nature, Nicodemus could not comprehend it. When he failed to understand what the Savior meant, he introduced the well-known symbol of spiritual purification, water, to illustrate what he meant by being born of the Spirit.

"Born of water" does not mean baptism. The expression "born of water and of the Spirit" does not mean that there are *two births* necessary to enter into the kingdom of God. "Born of water" is used simply as an illustration of the meaning of "born of the Spirit." We have an example of this method of illustration in Matthew iii, 11: "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." This does not mean that there are two baptisms performed by Christ on those who accept him, but one—the baptism of the Holy Ghost—like fire, consuming sin, and filling the soul with spiritual heat and life. The copulative conjunction *kai* (and) is used in both passages, and

questionably means the same thing in both. To be "born," then, of "water and of the Holy Spirit," is to be regenerated and purified by the Holy Spirit, as water applied to the body as a religious rite makes it legally or ceremonially clean.

In Titus iii, 5, 6, we read: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior."

It is contended by the advocates of baptismal regeneration and baptismal remission that "the washing of regeneration" in this passage is baptism, and that Paul here affirms that we are saved by "the *bath of regeneration;*" that is, by baptism. But we must not forget that Paul ascribes our salvation, not to "works of righteousness which we have done"—that is, not to any act or acts of obedience that we may have performed—but to "his mercy," and that mercy is made effectual "by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." We ask: Does Paul affirm that the "washing of regeneration" and "the renewing of the Holy Ghost" are two separate and distinct processes or operations, or does he mean that they are two features presented to us of one process; the one referring to the cleansing of the heart from past sins, washing them away; the other to the renewing of the spiritual nature in the image

of the Son of God? If he means the former, then it is certain that baptism, "the washing of regeneration," according to Mr. Campbell, does not save us; for that which saves us is "*shed on us.*" But, according to him, baptism is not "*shed on us*," nor is the water shed on us in baptism, but we are plunged into it. But Paul is not here speaking of baptism at all. There is no reference or allusion to baptism in the passage. "The washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost" are one and the same thing. "The washing of regeneration" means the washing away of past sins by the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit applying the merit of the blood of Christ to the soul, by which alone sins are washed away; while "the renewing of the Holy Ghost" is the creating of the soul anew in Christ Jesus, "washing" and "renewing" being but parts of the one divine process by which we are brought into the kingdom of God and made heirs of eternal life.

But Ephesians v, 25, 26, and Acts xxii, 16, are cited by the advocates of baptismal regeneration and remission to prove that the Church is cleansed "by the washing of water," and that sins are "washed away in baptism." In the first passage Paul says: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." In the second, Ananias says: "And now why

tarriest thou; arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."

But we ask: "In what sense does Christ cleanse the Church 'by the washing of water,' and in what sense are sins washed away in baptism?"

In Revelation i, 5, we read: "Unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood." And in chapter vii, 13, 14, we read: "And one of the elders answered, saying unto me, What are these which are arrayed in white robes? and whence came they? And I said unto him, Sir, thou knowest. And he said to me, These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."

Here we have two washings—one of blood, the other of water. These two washings are not for the same purpose. Sins can not be washed away and the Church cleansed by the blood of Christ, and afterwards by water. By one of these washings sins are *really* washed away, and the Church is *really* cleansed; and by the other, sins are only *emblematically* washed away, and the Church is only *emblematically* cleansed. Which is the *real* and which is the *emblematical* washing? Is the Apocalyptist mistaken when he affirms that Christ "washed us from our sins in his own blood?" Is the elder before the throne mistaken when he says the white-robed throng "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb?"

Either they are mistaken, or those are mistaken who teach that the Church is cleansed in a "bath of water," and that sins are washed away in baptism. Which shall we believe, the Beloved Disciple and the elder before the throne, or the advocates of baptismal remission?

Mr. Campbell says "Here are two things equally incomprehensible—to wash garments WHITE in blood, and to wash away sins in water. An efficacy is ascribed to water which it does not possess; and as certainly an efficacy is ascribed to blood which it does not possess. If blood can whiten or cleanse garments, certainly water can wash away sins. There is, then, a transferring of the efficacy of blood to water, and a transferring of the efficacy of water to blood." (Christianity Restored, pp. 220, 221.)

If Mr. Campbell had more carefully studied the figure used by the Apocalyptist of washing garments in blood, he would have been saved this foolish blunder, which led him to ascribe to water the efficacy to wash away sin. John does not teach that "garments are washed and made white in blood;" for in chapter xix, 8, in speaking of the attire of the Church, the "wife" of the Lamb, he says: "And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white; FOR THE FINE LINEN IS THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF SAINTS."

Garments washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb is only a figure of speech, representing the

great truth, that sins are washed away, and the soul made righteous and clean in the sight of God, by the blood of the Lamb; for the white robes are "the righteousness of saints." The Bible nowhere ascribes to blood the power to whiten *literal* garments, nor to water to wash away sins.


Methodist
Historical Society
Southern California - Arizona
Conference

CHAPTER VIII.

JESUS NEVER TAUGHT BAPTISM FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS, NOR COMMANDED ANY ONE TO BE BAPTIZED FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS, DURING THE ENTIRE PERIOD OF HIS PERSONAL MINISTRY ON EARTH.

It does seem to me that the best and surest way to find out the gospel method of forgiveness and salvation, would be to go to the words and acts of the Lord Jesus during his personal ministry while here on earth. If we can not find the gospel method of forgiveness and salvation in the words and acts of Jesus, where can we expect to find it? Now, it is a remarkable fact, that in all the preaching and teaching of the Lord Jesus, there is not a hint or intimation that baptism is for the remission of sins. Did Jesus preach his own gospel during his personal ministry? If he did, then his gospel does not teach baptism for the remission of sins, and the gospel of baptismal remission is "another gospel," and not the gospel of Jesus. This is as clear as that two and two make four.

Our Lord instituted his baptism at the *beginning*, and not at the *end* of his personal ministry. His apostles practiced it from the time they were called to the apostolic office under his immediate supervis-

ion. The great commission did not institute his baptism any more than it did the preaching of his gospel. It simply extended the work of the apostles, which before had been confined to the Jews, to all the world. Their first commission was to preach the gospel to the Jews only, and to baptize those of them who should receive Jesus as the Messiah. The second embraced all the nations, but it is the same gospel and the same baptism. Keeping this fact in mind, let us examine the law of pardon or remission of sins, as laid down by our Lord himself in his own gospel.

In John iii, 14–18, Jesus says: "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." Again he says: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." (John v, 24.) In chapter vi, 28, 29, we read: "Then said they unto him, What

shall we do, that we might work the works of God? Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." In verse 40 he says: "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day." In verse 47 he says: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life."

In these passages Jesus affirms a direct and immediate connection between faith in him and the possession of eternal life. To believe in Jesus, is to possess eternal life. This is predicated upon faith itself, and not upon "an act of faith," or an "act resulting from faith." He also affirms that condemnation is removed by believing in him. "He that believeth on him is NOT CONDEMNED"—condemnation is removed *by faith*, and not by an act of faith or "*an act resulting from faith.*" If a man is not condemned, he is pardoned, justified, and his sins are remitted. We might multiply passages from the words of our Lord; but these are sufficient, and they reflect the whole trend of his teachings.

In exact accord with his teaching, and in illustration of it, he forgave sins while he was here on earth, upon the condition of *simple faith*, and not by baptism. Now, it does seem to me that if we can find out the condition or conditions upon which he remitted sins, we shall find out the gospel method of

remission. The first example we have of the forgiveness of sins by our Lord, is recorded in Matt. ix, 1–7; Mark ii, 1–12; Luke v, 18–26. In Mark's account it is said: "When Jesus saw their faith, he said to the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins be forgiven thee." This man's sins were forgiven on the condition of his *faith.* Christ required nothing more than his faith in him. He did not say to Peter: "I see this man has faith in me, and has repented of his sins, and has confessed me before men, by coming to me for healing and forgiveness; take him and wash away his sins in baptism." He said nothing of the kind. But looking into the poor man's heart, and into the hearts of his friends, "he saw their faith." That was enough. He did not wait for anything further, but immediately, on *their faith,* pronounced the sentence of forgiveness. When the scribes began in their hearts to accuse him of blasphemy, "he saw their thoughts," and demonstrated to them his power to forgive sins by healing the man of his bodily infirmity.

In Luke vii, 36–50, we have another illustration of Christ forgiving sins. Please turn and read the passage carefully. Here a weeping, trembling penitent sues for pardon at the feet of Jesus. She pours her penitential tears upon his feet, until she washes them with her tears, and then wipes them with the hairs of her head. Then, as he speaks to her heart in the voice of the Holy Spirit, and the conscious joy of sins forgiven takes possession of her spirit, she

showers the kisses of gratitude upon his feet, and pours the precious ointment upon them. The Pharisee, who had invited him to dine, was about to pronounce against him in his heart, when Jesus addressed him in the parable of the creditor and debtors, and then turning to the penitent at his feet said to her: "Thy sins are forgiven. . . . THY FAITH HATH SAVED THEE; go in peace."

This example fully illustrates the gospel law of pardon as taught and practiced by our Lord himself. He did not say to Peter, John, James, or any other of his disciples: "This woman has heard my word and believed in me, and has truly repented of her sins, and has confessed me before the world; take her and baptize her for the remission of her sins." He did not say to her: "Your faith is all right, and your repentance and confession are genuine, but you must be baptized in order that you may receive the remission of your sins." There was certainly nothing in the way of her baptism. The apostles were all present, ready to baptize her if the Master had commanded them to do it. But Jesus said not a word about baptism. He simply said unto her: "Thy sins are forgiven thee;" and then added, "THY FAITH hath saved thee." Her faith was the one condition of her forgiveness. He predicates her salvation from guilt and sin alone upon her FAITH. Her deep repentance prepared her to exercise faith, and without it she could not have exercised saving faith in the Son of

God. But her repentance could not wash away the stains of sin from her soul. The blood of Christ could alone do that, and nothing but faith could connect her soul with the blood which cleanses from all sin.

This example forever sets aside the doctrine of baptismal remission, and establishes the doctrine of justification by faith only, upon the immutable Rock of Ages. If baptism was not necessary for the remission of her sins, it is not necessary for the remission of anybody's sins. If her faith was all that was necessary to secure to her the forgiveness of her sins, it is all that is necessary in any case. There is no way to escape this conclusion but by denying that the law of pardon or remission of sins laid down and practiced by Christ during his personal ministry, is the law of his kingdom since his ascension to heaven. But this involves the absurdity, as I have already shown, of having Christ preach one gospel, and commanding his apostles to preach another. This can not be; therefore faith in Christ is and must be the *one* and *only* condition of pardon to the penitent sinner. This one clear example of the forgiveness of sins by our Lord, under his gospel, must settle the whole question of the law of pardon or remission in his kingdom, as completely as a thousand examples could do.

When Jesus gave the great commission to his apostles to "disciple all nations," he commanded them, saying: "Teaching them to observe all things what-

soever I have commanded you." Their teaching was to be restricted to the words of Jesus; they were to teach the nations what he had taught them, nothing more, nothing less. He did not teach them baptism for the remission of sins, and consequently he did not command them to teach baptism for the remission of sins to the nations. Could demonstration itself be clearer than this? It is inconceivable that our blessed Lord should spend three years and a half in preaching his own gospel, and teaching the people how they were to get their sins remitted, and never once mention or even allude to the most important condition of remission, and the one without which remission of sins can not be obtained. Yet he did this very thing, if the doctrine of baptismal remission is true. Surely by this time the unutterable absurdity of the doctrine of baptismal remission is apparent to every mind.

CHAPTER IX.

BAPTISM FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS—EXAMINATION OF PROOF TEXTS—JOHN'S BAPTISM.

HAVING carefully prepared the way in the preceding chapters, we are now prepared to take up and examine the passages of Scripture relied on by the advocates of baptismal remission to prove their doctrine. Mr. Alexander Campbell, in his "Christian Baptism," which may be safely regarded as his maturest thoughts on this question, says:

"It only remains in this part of our essay that we present, in the order of the inspired Books, all the passages that plainly import any connection between baptism and the remission of sins. They are the following:

"1. 'John did baptize and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.' (Mark i, 4.)

"2. 'The people of Judea and Jerusalem were baptized by him in Jordan, confessing their sins.' (Mark i, 5.)

"3. 'And he came into all the country about the Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.' (Luke iii, 3.)

"4. 'Repent and be baptized, every one of you,

in the name of the Lord Jesus, for the remission of sins.' (Acts ii, 38.)

"5. 'Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, invoking the name of the Lord.' (Acts xxii, 16.)"

On these passages he remarks: "These are oracles as express and explicit as any we can imagine. Any one of them would establish the connection for which we plead. For, if one such connection is clearly established, it depends not upon the repetition of it, but upon the clearness and definiteness of the expression of it."

This is intimated clearly in another passage:

"6. 'There is one Lord, one faith, *one baptism.*' (Ephesians iv, 5.)"

On this passage he remarks: "Now, if there be but one baptism, and if it appear that both the New Testament dispensations of baptism by John and the apostles clearly affirm a connection between baptism and remission of sins, must it not follow that the *only divinely instituted baptism is for the remission of sins?*"

Again he says: "I know, indeed, it may be said that there are two or three forms of expression that might be translated in such a way as to intimate some other connection."

For example: "As many of you as were baptized *for* Jesus Christ were baptized *for* his death." (Romans vi, 3.) "Know ye not that all our fathers were baptized *for* Moses, in the cloud and in the sea?"

(1 Corinthians x, 2.) "For by one Spirit are we all baptized *for* one body." (1 Corinthians xii, 13.) "For as many of you as have been baptized *for* Christ, have put on Christ." (Galatians iii, 27.)

"These four passages complete the canon—the whole volume on the subject of the relation of baptism to spiritual rights, privileges, and honors." (Campbell on Baptism, pp. 251–253.)

Note here:

1. Mr. Campbell claims but *six* passages in all the New Testament which teach the doctrine of baptismal remission.

2. Three of these refer to John's baptism.

3. He gives but four more passages which show any "connection" to exist between "baptism and spiritual rights, privileges, and honors in the kingdom of God," and declares that "these four passages complete the canon, the whole volume on the subject of the relation of baptism to spiritual rights, privileges, and honors."

4. Not one of these ten passages, which constitute the *whole teaching of the sacred volume* on this important subject, is taken from the words of Jesus. He who came to preach his own everlasting gospel, in all his ministry never uttered a single *word* that is claimed by Mr. Campbell to teach that baptism is for the remission of sins, or that "spiritual rights, privileges, or honors" in his kingdom are in any way "connected" with baptism.

Compare the preaching of Christ with that of Mr. Campbell and his followers on this point. Jesus never said a word about baptism for the remission of sins in all the sermons that he ever preached. Mr. Campbell never preached a sermon touching the forgiveness of sins, and his followers never preach a sermon on this important subject that they do not teach this as the very essence of the gospel, and without which no man can hope to obtain remission of sins. Was there ever a more perfect contrast?

5. I have already shown, in Chapter VI, that three of Mr. Campbell's ten passages (Romans vi, 3; 1 Corinthians xii, 13, and Galatians iii, 27) have no reference whatever to water baptism, but that they refer to the baptism of the Holy Ghost. 1 Corinthians x, 2, has no reference to Christian baptism, and it will not be contended for a moment that it was for the remission of sins. It was simply thrown in to fill out the number ten. Mr. Campbell himself admits that Acts xxii, 16, does not teach baptism for the remission of sins; for he expressly states that "Paul's sins were *really* pardoned when he believed," and that they were only "formally washed away in the waters of baptism."

6. It would take a wiser man than Solomon to find out that Ephesians iv, 5, teaches baptism for the remission of sins. How remission of sins is obtained is not the subject of discussion in this chapter, but the unity of the body of Christ. Paul shows that

this unity is beautifully expressed and symbolized by the one baptism which represents it.

We have thus effectually disposed of *six* of Mr. Campbell's ten passages, which constitute the whole "canon of the sacred volume on the subject of the relation of baptism to spiritual rights, privileges, and honors in the kingdom of God," leaving but *four* passages in the whole Bible upon which to rest his doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins. Three of his remaining four passages refer to John's baptism, and one of them speaks only of "confession," and says nothing about remission. It is Mark i, 5, and reads: "And there went out unto him all the land of Judea and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins." Their submission to John's baptism was a public acknowledgment or confession that they were sinners. That is all that this passage declares. It says nothing about how they were to receive remission of their sins, whether by or in baptism, or by faith, or by anything else. How they obtained remission of their sins, which, by their baptism they confessed, this passage does not tell us; and, so far as it is concerned, it leaves the whole matter to inference and conjecture. This leaves but three passages out of Mr. Campbell's ten that can be claimed with any plausibility to teach the doctrine of baptismal remission, and two of these refer to John's baptism.

Now, the question arises, Was John's baptism "the

baptism of repentance," as he himself expressly affirms, or was it "the baptism of remission," as Mr. Campbell and his followers affirm? Everywhere in the New Testament where the character of John's baptism is spoken of, it is called "*the baptism of repentance;*" and never "*the baptism of remission.*" John's baptism remitted no man's sins; it was simply a public sign or profession of repentance, while by his preaching he gave the knowledge of salvation by, or more properly *through*, the remission of sins, by pointing out to the people the Christ through whom alone remission of sins can be obtained, and exhorted them to *believe in him.*

In Acts xix, 1–5, we read: "And it came to pass that while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coast came to Ephesus, and finding certain disciples, he said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said, Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him that should come after him; that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard *this* they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus."

1. Here Paul expressly affirms (1) that John's baptism was "the baptism of repentance;" (2) that he taught the people whom he baptized "that they

must believe on the Lord Jesus." John taught the same doctrine that Paul did—that salvation is received through faith in Christ, and not by baptism. His whole doctrine is called "the baptism which he preached," because "baptizing with water" was a great and prominent feature of his mission and work, and hence, by a common figure of speech, it is put for the whole. He "baptized *unto repentance*," and *preached something for the remission of sins.* What was it that he preached for the remission of sins? It was faith in Him who should come after him, and who should give them the remission of their sins and purity of heart by baptizing them with the Holy Ghost.

2. But if John's baptism was "*for* the remission of sins," that is, "*in order to* the remission of sins;" and if Christian baptism is for the remission of sins, that is, "*in order to remission* of sins,"—then it is clear that we have two baptisms in the New Testament *for*, that is, "*in order to, remission of sins*," and the same persons during the ministry of John, and of Christ and the apostles, were baptized TWICE "*for the remission of sins!*" There is no getting around this fact. Every person whom John baptized, and who afterwards became a disciple of Christ, was baptized with Christian baptism. Christian baptism was instituted by Christ at the very beginning of his ministry, and practiced by his disciples contemporary with the baptism of John.

In John iii, 22–26, we read:

"After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea; and there he tarried with them, and baptized. And John also was baptizing in Ænon near to Salim, because there was much water there: and they came, and were baptized. For John was not yet cast into prison. Then there arose a question between *some* of John's disciples and the Jews about purifying. And they came unto John, and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all *men* come to him."

Again in John iv, 1–3, we read:

"When therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, (though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples,) he left Judea, and departed again into Galilee."

It is evident from these passages, that Christian baptism was not originally instituted and commanded in the great commission, and practiced first on the day of Pentecost; but that it was instituted by our Lord in the very beginning of his ministry and practiced by his apostles, from the time they were called to the apostolic office.

Now, we inquire, can a man's sins be remitted, after they have already been remitted? Do the Scriptures require any man to be baptized *twice* for the remission of sins? Were the sins of the people whom

John baptized remitted by his baptism, and then remitted again by Christ's baptism? Most unquestionably they were, according to Mr. Campbell, for he expressly declares "*that the only divinely instituted baptism is for the remission of sins.*" Was John's baptism "*divinely instituted?*" Yes. Was Christ's baptism "*divinely instituted?*" Yes. Well, then, according to Mr. Campbell, they were both *instituted* "for the remission of sins." But this does not help me a particle—I can not see how a man can have his sins remitted twice! Yet we have multitudes whose sins were remitted by John's baptism; and then, a little while after, the same sins were remitted again by Christ's baptism! Will some advocate of baptismal remission please enlighten my benighted mind on this subject, and show me how these things can be?

Take, if you please, the twelve disciples whom Paul had rebaptized at Ephesus. Were their sins remitted by John's baptism, and then remitted again by Christian baptism? They were unquestionably baptized *twice,* by "*divinely instituted* baptisms," and, according to Mr. Campbell, they were most certainly baptized both times "*for,*" that is, "IN ORDER TO, the remission of sins!" But how a man can be baptized "IN ORDER TO the remission" of his sins, after his sins have been remitted, puzzles me, and I can not understand it!

Surely by this time the dullest intellect can see the utter absurdity of Mr. Campbell's position. It is cer-

tain that either (1) John's baptism was not *for* the remission of sins; or, (2) that Christian baptism is not *for* the remission of sins; or, (3) that neither was instituted *for* the remission of sins. Now, which one of these positions shall we take? If we take the Scriptural view of John's baptism—that it was "the baptism of repentance," and not of "remission"—then "*baptisma metanoias eis aphesin hamartion*" does not mean "baptism IN ORDER TO remission of sins," and the whole argument of the advocates of baptismal remission falls to the ground.

If the expression, "*eis aphesin hamartion*," here does not mean "in order to remission of sins," then, it can not mean it anywhere, and the controversy is at an end, and the doctrine of baptismal remission is overthrown; and Mr. Campbell's interpretation of this and similar passages is shown to be utterly false. If we take the position that John's baptism was *for* the remission of sins, but Christian baptism is not, the point is at once yielded, and the controversy at an end. So we see, take whatever position we may, to get out of this difficulty, the doctrine of baptismal remission must be abandoned.

The truth lies in the third proposition, "that neither John's baptism nor Christian baptism was instituted *for* the remission of sins." Both stand related to remission of sins and the purification of the heart, not as a condition IN ORDER TO obtain remission of sins and a clean heart, but as the outward emblem

of the inward and spiritual cleansing of the soul from sin by the baptism of the Holy Ghost, which John constantly pointed to as the special mission and work of Christ, and the antitype of his own baptism with water.

3. If John's baptism was for the remission of sins, then, we ask, how could the sinless Jesus be baptized by him? Mr. Campbell says:

"In the first place, then, no one is commanded to be baptized, *for anything else*, and no man is ever said to have been baptized *for anything else*, than for the remission of sins." (Campbell on Baptism, p. 252.)

Again he says:

"Evident then, it is, that there is no 'specific design' on account of which any one can constitutionally be baptized, except it be for the remission of sins previously committed." (Ibid., p. 253.)

If Mr. Campbell is correct here, again we ask, How could the twelve disciples at Ephesus who had already had their sins remitted by baptism, be constitutionally baptized? And how could the vast multitudes whose sins had been remitted by John's baptism, be constitutionally baptized by the apostles? According to Mr. Campbell, the apostles were all violators of the constitution of the kingdom of God, for they went right on baptizing persons for the remission of sins, whose sins had already been remitted by John's baptism! What a pity he had not lived eighteen hundred years earlier, so that he might have instructed

the apostles not to violate the constitution of the kingdom of heaven in this ruthless manner!

But we ask again, How could Christ be baptized if "the only divinely instituted baptism is for the remission of sins?" and if "no one is ever said to be baptized for anything else than for the remission of sins?" and if "no one can constitutionally be baptized, except for the remission of sins previously committed?" Was our blessed Lord baptized "for the remission of sins?" If not, did not John violate the constitution of the kingdom of heaven when he baptized him, and did not Christ himself violate the constitution of his own kingdom in submitting to baptism for an unconstitutional purpose?

Christ himself declared to John that it was necessary for him to be baptized in order "to fulfill all righteousness." What righteousness did Christ fulfill by his baptism? It was not moral righteousness, for he had already fulfilled all moral righteousness. Baptism belongs not to *moral*, but POSITIVE law; and it was not positive righteousness, for Mr. Campbell tells us, as we have seen, that no one is ever commanded to be baptized for anything except remission of sins, and Christ could not be baptized under such a command. It must, then, have been all ceremonial righteousness, or that enjoined by the ritual of the law of Moses.

The law required that Aaron and his sons should be washed with water at the door of the tabernacle.

and anointed with oil, to consecrate them to the priestly office. Jesus Christ is the Great High Priest of the Church of God, and it was necessary as he entered upon his priesthood, which was to supersede that of the House of Aaron, that he should be publicly consecrated to his priestly office. John, as the legal high priest of the House of Israel, had the right publicly to consecrate the Great High Priest, who should forever take the place of the typical priests of his own order. By his baptism, John and Christ fulfilled the righteousness of the law in this respect.

Aaron was washed with water at the door of the tabernacle, and anointed with oil, and was thus set apart to his priestly office. The washing was emblematical of the inward purification which a priest must have to minister acceptably before the Lord; and the anointing was emblematical of the power of the Holy Spirit resting upon him. So Jesus was washed with water, emblematical of his immaculate purity, and anointed with the Holy Ghost; not at the door of the tabernacle, for his priestly office is not confined to the House of Israel, but embraces the whole human family; hence, his consecration took place by the side of the river, under the canopy of heaven, at the door of that universal humanity, over which henceforth his priestly office was to be exercised. In this way his baptism fulfilled all righteousness, but it was not possible that it should ful-

fill it in any other way. If John's baptism was an emblem of moral purity, it was proper and right, and in exact agreement with its import, that He who represented the highest moral purity on earth should receive it in token of that purity. But if it was "*for*," that is, "in order to, the remission of sins," then no greater inconsistency could have been perpetrated on earth, than for "Him who knew no sin" to receive it, and thus go through the mockery of remission. The very fact that Jesus received the baptism of John must forever settle in the minds of all thoughtful men that John's baptism could not have been for the remission of sins.

While John's baptism was a profession of repentance on the part of those who received it, and an emblem of the purity of heart which its antitype, the baptism of the Holy Ghost, alone can confer, still its *supreme* object and end was the public manifestation of Christ to Israel by his public consecration to, and induction into, his priestly office, as John himself expressly affirms.

John i, 29–34, he says:

"The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world. This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is preferred before me; for he was before me. And I knew him not; but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water. And John

bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I knew him not; but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining upon him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God."

Here it is manifest that we have one "divinely instituted baptism" for a totally different purpose than that of the remission of sins, or John the Baptist was entirely mistaken in regard to the object of his own baptism. Looking at this declaration of John, in regard to the supreme object of his baptism, we can more clearly understand what the Master meant by, "thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." John's mission proper, ended with the public manifestation of Christ to Israel, by his consecration to his priestly office, and soon after ceased altogether by his imprisonment and death. John's baptism can furnish no authority for the doctrine of baptismal remission.

CHAPTER X.

BAPTISM FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS (ACTS II, 38)—CONVERSION OF CORNELIUS AND HIS HOUSEHOLD—REMISSION OF SINS THROUGH FAITH IN HIS NAME—THEIR HEARTS PURIFIED BY FAITH.

WE have now left but one single passage in all the New Testament which is claimed by Mr. Campbell to teach baptism for the remission of sins—Acts ii, 38. This passage is claimed as the stronghold of the advocates of this doctrine, and it is the foundation on which the whole system of baptismal remission rests. We will therefore examine it carefully and ascertain, if we can, whether it does teach that baptism is "*for*," that is, *in order to*, the remission of sins. It reads: "Then said Peter unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

The whole argument drawn from this passage in support of the doctrine of baptismal remission rests upon the Greek preposition "*eis*," here translated "*for*." The advocates of this doctrine claim that "*eis*," here translated "*for*," means "*in order to*," and consequently the passage means: "Repent and

be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, *in order that you may receive the remission of your sins.*" According to their teaching, one of the most important doctrines of the gospel rests for its support upon the interpretation they give to one little preposition of three letters. Take out this passage, and you take the foundation from under the whole system; and take out this little preposition "*eis*," or rather their interpretation of it, and you at once destroy the force of it to sustain their doctrine.

Is it possible that so important a doctrine can rest on such a slender foundation? One would suppose from the stress they put upon their interpretation of this little preposition that it never had any other meaning, or that this is at least its *primary* and *general* meaning in the New Testament. But this is by no means the case. It occurs one thousand seven hundred and forty-two times in the New Testament. Of these it is translated *for* one hundred and twenty-one times. In forty of these it is used with *ever*, leaving but eighty-one times out of one thousand seven hundred and forty-two in which it is translated *for* in the various meanings of that word. The interpretation of "*eis*," translated *for* in this passage by the advocates of baptismal remission, is neither the *primary* nor *general* meaning of the word. It is very seldom, if ever, used in the sense of "in order to" or "as a condition of."

The rule we must observe in the interpretation of

language is, words are always to be understood in their most usual signification, unless their connection forbids it. The most usual meaning of the Greek preposition "*eis*," here translated *for* in the New Testament, is *into*. The advocates of baptismal remission contend that this is its *primary* meaning also, and in this they are sustained by many high authorities. Suppose we give it its *usual* meaning here, and translate it *into*, instead of *for*, the result will be the complete overthrow of the whole argument in favor of baptismal remission drawn from this passage. But perhaps some one will ask: "What have you gained by this translation?" I answer, we shall see in a moment. If we can ascertain what "*eis*," "*into*," means in such examples of its use in the New Testament, it will not be difficult to ascertain its meaning in this passage. Let us examine a few examples of its use in such connections:

1. "I indeed baptize you [*eis metanoian*] *into repentance*." (Matthew iii, 11.) Our translators render "*eis*" *unto* in this passage, but it should be translated properly "*into repentance*." To be baptized "into repentance" certainly does not mean "*in order to repentance*." John did not baptize the people "*in order*" that they might repent, but *because they had repented*. "*Eis metanoian, into repentance*," then, must mean *a sign of repentance*, or a profession that they had already repented, and not "*for*," or "*in order to*," repentance. Place along-side of this

Peter's language in this passage, "*eis aphesin hamartion*," and on what ground can it be translated "*in order to remission of sins?*" The cases are exactly parallel, and I demand the authority for interpreting the one "*a sign or profession of*," and the other "*a condition in order to.*" If "*eis metanoian*" (Matthew iii, 11) means "a sign of repentance," or "a profession of repentance," as it unquestionably does, then "*eis aphesin hamartion*" must mean "a sign of remission of sins," or a profession of faith that "remission of sins" is received only in the name of Jesus.

2. "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them [*eis to onoma*] *into* the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." (Matthew xxviii, 19.)

Mr. Campbell translates "*eis*" in this passage "*into.*" What does it mean to be baptized "*into* the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost?" It surely does not mean "*in order to*" the name, etc. It can mean but one thing, and that is a sign or profession of faith in, and obedience to, the Triune God. Put these two expressions together, "*eis to onoma*," and "*eis aphesin hamartion*," and give me the law of interpretation by which you make "*eis*" to mean "as a profession of faith" in one, and "as a condition of the remission of sins" in the other!

3. "And were all baptized [*eis ton Mosen*] *into* Moses." (1 Cor. x, 2.)

What does it mean to be baptized "*into* Moses?" Surely "*eis*" in this passage can not mean "in order to Moses!" To be baptized into Moses can have but one meaning, and that is, the baptism was a public sign, or profession of faith in Moses, and obedience to him as a divinely appointed teacher and leader.

4. "Were ye baptized [*eis to onoma Paulou*] *into* the name of Paul?" (1 Cor. i, 13.)

Surely "*eis*" does not mean "in order to," or "as a condition of," in this passage. Baptized "INTO the name of Paul" can only mean that such a baptism would have been a profession of faith in, and submission to, the authority of Paul.

Here we have four parallel examples of the use of "*eis*," in connection with baptism, in not one of which can it be translated "in order to," but in every one of them it means "as a sign, or profession of." By every law of interpretation, then, we are bound to give it this signification in Acts ii, 38, and this settles the whole controversy. Baptism "*into* remission of sins" does not mean "in order to remission of sins," but it means that baptism is a profession or declaration of the faith that remission of sins comes only through the name of Christ; hence it is *a sign of* remission of sins, just as baptism "*into repentance*" is a sign of repentance.

The Revised Version translates "*eis*," in Acts ii, 38, "*unto*," as in Matt. iii, 11, and not "*for*." It reads: "And Peter said unto them, Repent ye, and be

baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

If baptized "*unto* repentance" means "*as a sign of* repentance," as all admit that it does, then "baptized *unto* remission of sins means "as a sign of remission of sins." The two expressions are exactly similar, and *eis* translated "*unto*" in both passages means the same thing. So whether we translate "*eis*" "*into*," or "*unto*," in this passage, it means exactly the same—not "*in order to*," but "*as a sign of*."

But we have another preposition in this passage, "*epi*," the force of which has been strangely overlooked by the advocates of baptismal remission. "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, *epi* the name of Jesus Christ." The literal meaning of "*epi*" is "*upon*," and not "*in*." What does the expression "baptized [*epi*] upon the name of Jesus Christ" mean? It does not mean, as is usually understood by the advocates of baptismal remission, that baptism is performed in the name of Jesus Christ—that is, that his name is named upon us in baptism—for baptism is never performed in the name of Jesus Christ, but "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Their interpretation, therefore, of this expression can not be true. It has a far deeper meaning. "His name," and "in his name," stand for his merit, his atoning sacrifice. "Believing in his name" is relying on his merit, his atone-

ment for salvation. "*Epi,*" upon—in connection with the name of Jesus Christ—means trusting in, or relying upon, the name; that is, trusting in the merit, the atoning sacrifice of Christ.

Winer, in his large Greek Grammar of the New Testament, pp. 392, 393, says:

"*Figuratively, epi* denotes, in general, the foundation on which an action or state rests; . . . to do something upon the name of some one; *i. e.*, in doing it to rely upon, or have reference to, the name of some one."

Dr. Edward Robinson, in his Greek Lexicon of the New Testament, after quoting the words of Peter in this verse, says: "Be baptized into Christ; that is, professing a belief in him, and a devotedness to his service."

Thayer, in his Greek Lexicon, says:

"To do anything *epi to onomati tinos,* relying upon the name, *i. e.*, the authority of any one. . . . *Baptistheto epi to onomati Christou,* so as to repose your hope and confidence in his Messianic authority. (Acts ii, 38.)"

We see these three great authorities declare that "*epi*" in this passage, and in similar connections, means "relying upon," "reposing in," etc. Giving "*epi*" this sense, the passage reads:

"Repent and be baptized, every one of you, *relying on the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.*"

Mr. Wesley puts it clearly in his comment on this

verse. He says: "*Repent*, and hereby return to God; *be baptized, believing in the name of Jesus, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.*"

When we get at the real import of the preposition "*epi*," as used in this passage, the idea of baptism "for the remission of sins," which the advocates of baptismal remission try to make so prominent, totally disappears from it, and Peter declares here, as he does everywhere else, that "remission of sins" is received through "*reliance on*," that is, "faith in the name, the atoning merits" of our Lord Jesus Christ. Acts ii, 38, must be forever abandoned as teaching baptism for the remission of sins. A proper exegesis of it demonstrably proves that it teaches no such doctrine, but, on the contrary, it swings into harmony with the universal teachings of the Divine Word, and declares that "remission of sins" is received alone through faith in the name of the Lord Jesus.

That this is the meaning of Peter's language on the day of Pentecost is demonstrated by his language to Cornelius and his household. (Acts x, 43.) Please turn and read the account of the conversion of Cornelius and his household, recorded in the tenth chapter of Acts.

1. Cornelius was an earnest penitent, seeking for the knowledge of the remission of sins.

2. He was directed by an angel of God to send for Peter, of whom the angel declared: "He shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do" (Acts x, 6), or, as

Peter puts it, "Who shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved." (Acts xi, 14.)

3. Peter came and told Cornelius what he "ought to do." He told him "words whereby he and all his house were saved."

4. What "words" did he tell him? His sermon is recorded in Acts x, 34–43; but in it there is not one word about baptism *for the remission of sins.* His sermon was very brief, and closed with this remarkable sentence: "To him give all the prophets witness, that *through his name* whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins."

5. "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word."

Now, observe here:

1. Peter connects remission of sins with the "*name*" of Jesus, as he does in Acts ii, 38.

2. That remission of sins is received by believing in him, as in Acts ii, 38.

3. The "*name*" of Jesus is the ground of remission, and faith in him is the condition of the remission of sins. This is precisely the doctrine Peter taught on the day of Pentecost.

4. Cornelius and his household were received of God, their sins were remitted, and their hearts were "purified by faith" before they received baptism, and before Peter had said one word about baptism to them.

5. Then Peter said: "Can any man forbid water

that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?"

6. Peter "commanded them to be baptized," not for the remission of sins—for their sins had already been remitted—but because "they had received the Holy Ghost."

7. If Peter taught baptism for the remission of sins on the day of Pentecost, he preached one gospel for the Jews and another for the Gentiles, for he certainly did not preach baptism for the remission of sins to the household of Cornelius. Either our interpretation of Acts ii, 38, is true, or Peter preached one thing for remission of sins on the day of Pentecost, and a totally different thing to the household of Cornelius.

8. Did Peter tell Cornelius and his household "words whereby they could be saved," as the angel declared he should? If he did, then baptism is not for the remission of sins, for Peter never told them one single word on that subject.

9. Here we have a representative case. It is the opening of the door of faith to the Gentiles; and if ever there was a time, place, and circumstances under which we may expect the gospel method of pardon or remission of sins to be fully and explicitly laid down, we may expect it in this case. The very thing Cornelius wanted to know was, how to obtain *remission of sins.* The angel had promised him that Peter should tell him "*what he ought to do*" to obtain remission of sins, or to "*be saved.*" Peter did,

in the most explicit and formal manner "tell him what he ought to do;" he did lay down to him the gospel law of pardon, or remission of sins, and Cornelius and his household did accept the gospel law of remission, and they did receive remission of sins. Peter said: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through *his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.*" He here affirms that this doctrine of remission of sins through "faith in his name" is the doctrine of all the prophets. The whole teaching of the Word of God on the doctrine of the remission of sins is summed up in one single sentence, and Cornelius and his household accept it, believe in Jesus, and are saved in an instant, "while Peter is yet speaking."

10. Peter himself expressly affirms that their hearts were *purified by faith,* not by baptism.

In giving an account of their conversion in the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv, 7–9), he says: "Men and brethren, ye know that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel and believe. And God which knoweth the hearts bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us, and put no difference between us and them, *purifying their hearts by faith.*"

Observe:

1. Peter does not say that God gave them the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost. There is a vast

difference between receiving the Holy Ghost and receiving his miraculous gifts. Multitudes have received the Holy Ghost who have not received his miraculous gifts, but under the gospel no one has ever received the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost who had not first received the Holy Ghost himself.

2. He says: "And God which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost." What did God "bare them witness" to by "giving them the Holy Ghost?" It was most unquestionably to the fact that he had received them and forgiven their sins; for it is by the Holy Ghost that he witnesses this great fact to the hearts of the saved.

3. Finally, Peter affirms that God purified the hearts of the Jewish Christians by faith, just as he did the hearts of Cornelius and his household. "And put no difference between us and them, *purifying their hearts by faith.*" Both Jews and Gentiles were *purified,* forgiven, and saved alike. If Peter is here correct, that the Jews who were converted on the day of Pentecost had "their hearts purified by faith," then they most unquestionably were not baptized for the remission of sins any more than Cornelius and his household were. Peter's declaration, "And put no difference between us and them," covers the whole ground, and proves conclusively that all, both Jews and Gentiles, who were converted under the ministry of the apostles, had "their hearts purified *by faith,*" and not by baptism. This is the one and universal

law of remission and heart purification; and it covers all nations and all ages. The doctrine of baptismal remission is thus proven to be false and unscriptural by the very apostle whose words have been relied on to prove it. Surely no further argument is necessary to prove the utter unscripturalness of the doctrine of baptismal remission.

CHAPTER XI.

THE APOSTLES EVERYWHERE TEACH THAT IT IS THROUGH FAITH, AND NOT THROUGH AN ACT OF FAITH, THAT PARDON OR REMISSION OF SINS IS OBTAINED—THEY AFFIRM AN IMMEDIATE CONNECTION BETWEEN FAITH AND THE PARDON OF SINS.

WE HAVE already seen that Peter teaches that it is by *faith*, and not by "an act of faith," that remission of sins is obtained. The same great truth is taught by John, the beloved disciple, both in his Gospel and in his Epistle. In John i, 11, 12, we read: "He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the Sons of God, *even* to them that believe on his name."

Here the privilege or power of sonship in the family of God is conferred through *faith*, and not through "an act of faith." Receiving Christ is "believing on his name," and "believing on his name" is receiving him.

In 1 John v, 1, we read: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." It is not by "an act of faith" that John teaches us that we are born of God, but by *faith itself*. The moment a man believes, he is born of God. In verse 10 of this same

chapter John says: "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself." Here the divine testimony that we are sons of God is predicated on *faith*, and not "an act of faith."

In the Epistles of Paul, and in his sermons reported by Luke in the Acts of the Apostles, we have the doctrine of justification by faith set forth in the fullest and clearest manner possible. In Romans x, 8-10, he says: "But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, *even* in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."

Here is a most positive declaration that it is by the faith of the heart, and not by an "outward act of faith," or "an act resulting from faith," that the sinner is justified. Not a word here about anything but the faith of the heart as necessary to justification. "For with the heart man believeth [*eis dikaiosunen*] into justification." Justification or righteousness is here declared to be the direct and immediate result of the faith of the heart. Language could not be more explicit than is this declaration of Paul that justification is secured by the faith of the heart.

In Acts xiii, 38, 39, Paul declares: "Be it known unto you therefore, men *and* brethren, that through

this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses."

Here again justification is predicated upon faith in Christ. Not a word about "an act of faith," or "an act resulting from faith," as necessary to justification.

In Romans iii, 21–26, Paul sets forth the doctrine of justification by faith so clearly that it seems impossible to misunderstand him. He says: "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference: for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth *to be* a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God. To declare, *I say*, at this time his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

Here the apostle sets forth both the ground and the condition of our justification. The ground of our justification is the blood of Jesus. This is our propitiation, our redemption. The condition of remission of sins and justification before God, is "faith in his blood." This is the "righteousness of God which is by

faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe." In view of "the propitiation" of the blood of Christ, God can now "be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Not a word is said here of justification by, or through, "an act of faith," or "an act resulting from faith," but it is justification, or remission of sins, "*through faith in his blood.*" This one passage ought to settle the question forever, and it must in all thoughtful minds who are not hopelessly blinded by prejudice. In verse 30 he says: "Seeing *it is* one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith." Here Jew and Gentile alike are justified, not by "an act of faith," or "an act resulting from faith," but by faith itself. No other of the apostles gives such an elaborate exposition of the law of pardon as does the apostle Paul. In all his preaching and writings he sets forth faith in Christ—the faith of the heart—as the *one* and *only* condition of justification to the penitent sinner. This is the grand central doctrine of the Pauline system—*justification by faith.* This is the first, grand, and leading characteristic of all his teaching.

The second leading and conspicuous feature or characteristic of his sermons and epistles is the absence of any allusion to baptism as in any way connected with the remission of sins. Not a word can be found in all the writings or sermons of Paul where he even intimates that baptism is a condition of remission of sins. It is inconceivable that the

great apostle of the Gentiles, in his elaborate exposition of the law of pardon, should leave out the most essential condition, and the one without which remission of sins can not be obtained. Compare Paul's writings on justification with those of any leading advocate of the doctrine of baptismal remission on this subject, and the contrast is at once apparent and striking. Baptism does not enter into Paul's system of justification at all—it has no place in it. But in the other system it is the central idea—the final condition without which all others are rendered nugatory and void. Is it possible that these two systems, the one in which baptism is so conspicuously absent, and the other in which it is so conspicuously present, can be one and the same? No man holding the doctrine of baptismal remission could have given Paul's answer to the Philippian jailer without repudiating his whole system. Look at the contrast between these two systems, and then in your heart answer the question, Can they be one and the same system?

Mr. Campbell could not have written the Epistle to the Romans, nor could Paul have written Mr. Campbell's essay on "Remission of Sins" in "Christianity Restored," or his essay on "The Design of Baptism" in his "Christian Baptism." Put the Epistle to the Romans along-side of either of those essays, and the contrast is perfect—the antagonism complete.

Paul's views of baptism, as expressed in 1 Co-

rinthians i, 14–18, demonstrably proves that he could not attach a saving efficacy to it. He says: "I thank God that I baptized none of you but Crispus and Gaius; lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name. And I baptized also the household of Stephanas: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other. For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect. For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish, foolishness; but unto us which are saved, it is the power of God."

How could Paul have used this language if he believed that baptism was for the remission of sins? How could he thank God that he baptized so few if the word he preached, and their faith in it, could be made effectual in their salvation only by baptism? How could he say, "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel," if the gospel can become "the power of God unto salvation" *only* through baptism? In verse twenty-one of this same chapter he says: "For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." But the advocates of the doctrine of baptismal remission declare that this is not true, for they tell us: "The gospel may be preached, a man may hear it and believe it; but he is still unsaved until he is baptized." They tell us "no man is saved by be-

lieving the gospel. It is by obeying the gospel—that is, by *being baptized*—that men are saved." According to them, Paul ought to have said, "It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that are *baptized;*" for with them, no one is saved until he is baptized. But Paul never taught any such doctrine. Throughout his writings faith is the one condition of the remission of sins to the penitent believer. The moment the penitent exercises faith in the Lord Jesus, that moment he is justified, pardoned, and adopted into the divine family. Mr. Campbell, in speaking of faith, admits that it constitutes a man "a son of God." He says: "Now as faith in God is the first principle—the soul-renewing principle of religion; as it is the regenerating, justifying, sanctiing principle—without it, it is impossible to be acceptable to God. With it, a man is a son of Abraham, a son of God, an heir apparent to eternal life—an everlasting kingdom." (Christian Baptism, p. 293.)

If faith "is the regenerating, justifying, sanctifying principle," then baptism is not "the regenerating, justifying, and sanctifying principle." If "with it a man is a son of God," then he is not constituted a son of God by baptism, nor is he regenerated or justified by baptism; for faith, with Mr. Campbell, precedes baptism. It does not take a philosopher to see that if a man is "justified" and made "a son of God" when he has faith, he can not be "justified" or made "a son of God" by any act subsequent to

the possession of faith. How a man could write such a paragraph as the above, and still contend that a man is "justified" and made a son of God by baptism, transcends my powers to comprehend. This paragraph is sound and Scriptural, but it is utterly at war with the doctrine which teaches that a man is justified and made a son of God, not by faith, but "by an act of faith," that is, by baptism.

CHAPTER XII.

PAUL'S GREAT ARGUMENT ON JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH WITHOUT WORKS (ROMANS IV)—ABRAHAM'S JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH—FAITH IMPUTED FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS—ABRAHAM'S JUSTIFICATION BY WORKS (JAMES II, 21–24.)

PAUL'S crowning argument on justification by faith is found in Romans iv, 1–8, drawn from the justification of Abraham. He says: "What shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found? For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God. For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin."

In this passage Abraham's justification is held up

before us as the pattern of our justification. As Abraham was justified, so shall all men be justified, who are justified under the gospel. In the same sense in which faith was *imputed* to Abraham for righteousness, it shall be imputed to all believers; for Paul says in verses twenty-three and twenty-four: "Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead."

A careful analysis of this passage shows:

1. That Abraham was not justified by works; he did nothing in the shape of works, or obedience, as the ground upon which he expected to be justified.

2. He "believed God, and it [*his believing God, his faith*] was counted unto him for righteousness."

3. In his justification he "*worked not*," but simply with his heart "*believed God*," and, as an ungodly man, he was justified by faith.

4. This justification was an imputation of faith for righteousness, *without works*.

5. If this is not "justification *by faith only*," what is it?

What was counted or imputed to Abraham for righteousness? Was it his faith, or was it "*an act of faith*," or was it "*an act resulting from faith*," or was it his works of obedience?

In Genesis xv, 6, where the transaction is recorded to which Paul refers, it is said: "And he be-

lieved in the LORD, and he counted it to him for righteousness." It was not his "obedience," or "an act of faith," or "an act resulting from his faith," but his believing in God, his *faith itself*, that was counted to him for righteousness. Here we have an end of controversy, and the great truth that Abraham was justified by faith without works—that is, "*by faith only*"—is established by the positive "thus saith the Lord."

But the advocates of baptismal remission meet us here with James ii, 21–24: "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness, and he was called the Friend of God. Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only."

They quote this passage with an air of triumph, and say to us, "Does not James here say that 'a man is justified by works, and *not by faith only?*'" and they think they have completely answered our argument, and overthrown the doctrine of "justification by faith only." But, I ask, are Paul and James in these two passages both speaking of the same transaction, and do they both use the term justification in the same sense? A glance at the two passages is sufficient to settle this question.

1. Paul is speaking of a transaction which took place before Ishmael was born, while James is speaking of a transaction which took place after Isaac was grown up to manhood. A period of not less than twenty-five, and perhaps as long as forty years elapsed between these two transactions.

2. Paul is speaking of the justification of an "ungodly" man, a sinner; hence he uses the term justification in the sense of pardon, or the remission of sins. But James is talking about the justification of a *righteous man*—one who had already been pardoned; hence he uses the term in the sense of *approval*. When was Abraham, as an ungodly man, a sinner, justified? Before Ishmael was born. How was he as an ungodly man, a sinner, justified? "He believed in the LORD; and he counted it to him for righteousness." When was Abraham as a righteous man justified? "When he had offered up Isaac his son upon the altar." How was he justified as a righteous man? By works. What did Abraham's justification by works prove? It proved that "the Scripture was fulfilled [that is, proved to be true], which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness." What was Abraham called when faith was imputed to him for righteousness? He was called "the Friend of God."

But Paul settles the question forever, as to when faith was imputed to Abraham for righteousness, whether it was when he offered up Isaac or before

that event, in Romans iv, 9–12. He says: "*Cometh* this blessedness then upon the circumcision *only*, or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. How was it then reckoned? when he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which *he had yet* being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also; and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which *he had* being *yet* uncircumcised."

Here we have the following things affirmed:

1. Faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness.

2. It was reckoned to him before he was circumcised.

3. That "he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which *he had yet* being uncircumcised." Circumcision was not merely *a seal* of Abraham's faith, but it was *a seal* of the *righteousness of the faith which he had* years before he was circumcised. Abraham had "the righteousness of faith," was pardoned, regenerated, and was the Friend of God before he was circumcised.

4. He received this sign and seal of the righteous-

ness of faith "that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; THAT RIGHTEOUSNESS MIGHT BE IMPUTED UNTO THEM ALSO."

5. "And the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had, being yet uncircumcised."

Now, either Abraham was justified by faith, had his sins pardoned, was regenerated, and called "the Friend of God," before he was circumcised, or both Paul and James are mistaken! But this is not all. Abraham was constituted "the father of many nations"—that is, of all believers—by the covenant of circumcision, which was established before Isaac was born. In Genesis xvii, 4-5, we read: "As for me, behold, my covenant *is* with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations. Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but Abraham; for a father of many nations have I made thee."

Paul affirms that by this very transaction Abraham was constituted the father of all believers. See Romans iv, 16-24: "Therefore *it is* of faith, that *it might be* by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all, (as it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations,) before him whom he believed, *even* God, who quickeneth the

dead and calleth those things which be not as though they were: who against hope believed in hope, that he might become the father of many nations, according to that which was spoken, So shall thy seed be. And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about a hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sarah's womb: he staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God; and being fully persuaded, that what he had promised, he was able also to perform. And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead."

Here Abraham is justified by grace through faith; constituted the father of all believers in all ages; "staggers not at the promise of God;" but is "fully persuaded that what he had promised, he was fully able to perform;" and his faith is imputed to him for righteousness, and he is called the Friend of God; and yet, according to the advocates of baptismal remission, he was still an unpardoned sinner, and remained so for years afterward, and did not get remission of his sins until he obtained it "by works," in offering up his son Isaac on the altar!! Is it possible that men can educate themselves actually to believe such revolting absurdities?

But this is not all. For many years before Abraham offered up Isaac, he walked in daily communion with God; was a constant worshiper of God, received every token possible of the Divine favor, and was a recognized prophet of God. In Gen. xx, 7, we read: "Now therefore restore the man his wife; for he is a prophet, and he shall pray for thee, and thou shalt live." And in verse 17 we read: "So Abraham prayed unto God: and God healed Abimelech, and his wife, and his maid-servants." Now, I ask, could all these things be, and yet Abraham be an unpardoned sinner? Reason, common sense, and the Word of God, all answer, No.

The advocates of the doctrine of baptismal remission, by their interpetation of James ii, 21-24, teach that a man may have "the righteousness of faith," be "the Friend of God," walk in constant communion with God, be a prophet of God, have his prayers answered daily; and also be in daily receipt of messages from God, be admitted into the closest intimacy with God, be strong in faith and stagger not at the promise of God; and have his faith honored of God in the most remarkable manner,—and still be an unpardoned sinner! All of these things follow from their interpetation of James ii, 21-24; for if Abraham was not pardoned until he offered up Isaac, then he enjoyed all of these blessings and favors while he was an unpardoned sinner!

But why do the advocates of baptismal remission

plunge themselves into such a mass of absurdities and contradictions by their interpretation of this passage? The answer to this question is found in Rom. iv, 23-24: "Now, it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead." It would not matter so much to them how Abraham was justified if Paul had not declared that his justification is the model and pattern of the justification of all believers under the gospel; that in the same sense in which faith was imputed to Abraham for righteousness, it shall be imputed to every one that believeth in Jesus. Faith in our risen Lord is imputed to us for righteousness, just as Abraham's faith in God was imputed to him for righteousness; hence his justification by faith without works, is held up by Paul as the model of the justification of all believers. As long, therefore, as it remains written that Abraham was justified by faith; that "to him that worketh not but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness," so long will it be true that the children of Abraham—all believers under the gospel—are "justified by faith, without works;" that their faith is imputed to them for righteousness also.

But what does James mean when he says: "Was not Abraham our father justified by works when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar?"

In this chapter James is not talking about the part faith and works play in the pardon of a sinner, but their relation to each other in the Christian life, after a man has been pardoned and brought into the family of God. In verse 18 he says: "Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works." Faith and works must go together in the Christian life; and a man can prove to the world that he has faith only by his works. But what has this to do with the pardon of sin? God sees the faith of the heart and on that, for Christ's sake, pardons sin; but that faith proves its existence to men by its fruits—good works. That this is what James means is evident; for he adduces Abraham's obedience to God as the evidence that the declaration of the Scripture—"Abraham believed God, and it [his believing God] was imputed to him for righteousness"—was true. How does James tell us that Abraham proved that "faith was imputed to him for righteousness," before Ishmael was born? By his works of obedience to God. Here James himself testifies that Abraham was justified, as a sinner, by faith; but as a righteous man he was justified by works; and this justification by works proved, says James, that he was justified by faith many years before, when it was written: "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." Thus we see that there is no conflict between Paul and James—both affirm

that "faith was imputed to him for righteousness;" that he was accounted righteous before God on account of his faith, and not on account of his works; and that his after life of obedience to God was the full proof of the truth of the Scripture which affirmed that his faith "was imputed to him for righteousness."

The history of the case in Gen. xxii, proves conclusively that this is the correct interpretation of this passage. In verse first we read: "And it came to pass after these things, that God did tempt Abraham." The word tempt here does not give us the true idea of the transaction. The word in the original, and in the Septuagint, means to try or test. To "tempt" in the ordinary sense of the word, is to solicit to evil. This God never does. But he tests or tries his servants, and he tested or tried Abraham's faith. It was not a test or condition of the remission of sins, but the test of the faith of a man of God, and the test proved to all the world the mighty faith of Abraham. In verses 11 and 12 we read:

"And the Angel of the Lord called unto him out of heaven, and said, Abraham, Abraham: and he said, Here am I. And he said, Lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou anything unto him: for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing that thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from me."

The angel did not say, "Now I know that thy sins are pardoned, and that thy works have brought thee salvation," but he says: "For now I know that thou

fearest God." This act did not give Abraham the character of the servant or Friend of God, but it proved the fact that he already possessed that character; hence it was the test of the faith of God's servant, God's prophet, not the test or condition upon which a sinner is to obtain remission of sins.

The term justification, or justified, is not always used in the sense of pardon, or the remission of sins. Jesus says: "For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." (Matt. xii, 37.) Surely Jesus does not mean in this passage that a man's sins are remitted by his words! He means that a man's words shall either approve him, or condemn him in the last day. Here justified is used in the sense of approved. Mr. Campbell tells us, "Justification is ascribed to seven causes" in the Bible. (Christianity Restored, p. 254.) It is a remarkable fact, however, that he does not find baptism among these seven causes of justification! Surely the term justification is not used in the same sense in all these passages, where justification is ascribed to so many causes! When a word is used in different significations, in different places, we must always study its meaning carefully in any given passage, to see what its import or meaning is in that passage, and not jump to the conclusion that because it is used in one sense in one place, therefore it must be used in that sense in every other place. That is the trouble with the advocates of baptismal remission. They see that

Paul, in Romans iv, uses the word justification, or justified, in the sense of pardon or the remission of sins, and hence they jump to the conclusion that James must use it in the same sense, and by their interpretation of James, they make him flatly contradict Paul; yea, and himself also.

But why should the advocates of baptismal remission quote James to prove that the sinner is justified by works? Mr. Campbell himself denies that the sinner is justified by works, and affirms that baptism is not a work of righteousness. He says: "The works of the law, and the works of faith are as different as law and gospel. Works, indeed, are to be considered as the embodiment of views, thoughts, emotions, volitions, and feelings. They are appreciable indications of the states of the mind; sensible exponents of the condition of the inner man. For example, he that seeks justification by the works of the law is not in a state of mind to be justified by the blood of Christ, or by the grace of God; he is ignorant of himself, ignorant of God; consequently, too proud of his powers to condescend to be pardoned or justified by the mere mercy and merits of another. . . . On the other hand, the works of him that is justified by faith are exponents of an essentially different state of mind. He is humble, dependent, grateful. Feeling himself undone, ruined, a debtor without hope to pay, he sues for mercy, and mercy is obtained; he is grateful, thankful, and hum-

ble before God. In this view of the matter, *to justify a man for* ANY WORK OF WHICH HE IS CAPABLE, would be to confirm him in carnality, selfishness, and pride. . . . *Justification by faith* in Christ is, then, the embodiment of views in perfect harmony with truth, with our condition, with the whole revealed character of God, and necessarily tends to humility, piety, humanity; while justification sought by works as naturally tends to pride, ingratitude, impiety, and inhumanity. . . . Baptism is, therefore, no work of law, no moral duty, no moral righteousness, but a simple putting on of Christ and placing ourselves wholly in his hands, and under his guidance." (Campbell on Baptism, pp. 282–284.)

Here Mr. Campbell repudiates the doctrine of justification by works *in toto*, and denies that baptism is in any sense a work by which a sinner may be justified. He teaches the doctrine of justification by faith in the most explicit terms, and boldly declares that the doctrine of justification by faith is "in perfect harmony with truth, with our condition, with the whole revealed character of God, and necessarily tends to humility, gratitude, piety, and humanity; while justification sought by works as naturally tends to pride, ingratitude, impiety, and inhumanity." After this, let us never hear one of his followers quote James to prove justification by works. Baptism with Mr. Campbell is not a work of law, or of any other kind, but "an act of faith;" how justification by

works, then, can prove that the sinner is justified by baptism, transcends my powers to comprehend. Plainly Mr. Campbell's disciples have gone beyond their teacher in attempting to prove that the sinner is justified by works, from James ii, 21–24; for he expressly declares that the sinner is not justified by works, but by faith.

If, then, the sinner is not justified by works, and if baptism is not a work, but "an act of faith," then James could not be speaking of the justification of Abraham as a sinner, in the sense of pardon; but of the justification of him as a righteous man, in the sense of approval.

If good works "are appreciable indications of the states of mind, sensible exponents of the inner man," as Mr. Campbell affirms that they are, then my interpretation of James ii, 21–24, is true, Mr. Campbell himself being judge: "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness; and he was called the Friend of God. Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." So, too, Paul's grand argument in favor of justification by faith "without works," in Romans iv, stand unimpeached and unimpeachable.

Here Mr. Campbell has helped us to clear away

the rubbish which his followers have thrown around the doctrine of "justification by faith only," and we have reached the everlasting rock of truth, that "Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness;" and that this was "written, not for his sake alone that it was imputed to him, but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead."

The End.

114279

BV
811.7
H8

114279

Hughey, George Washington
Baptismal remission

DATE DUE | BORROWER'S NAME

AP 1971
MY 31 '72

Hughey
Baptismal

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

PRINTED IN U.S.A.